NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCXLIII.

JUNE, 1909.

THE ACHILLES HEEL OF GERMANY

BY ARCHIBALD R. COLQUHOUN.

A POLITICAL prophecy in epigrammatic form which is frequently quoted in Europe declares that the twentieth century "belongs to the Germans." At the present time, when German diplomacy is so obviously and dramatically triumphant, most people would give an unquestioning assent to this proposition. The extraordinary progress of the German nation in the comparatively short period since its unification, the success of its diplomacy and the preponderance of its influence, backed by an enormous army and a growing navy, in the councils of Europe seem to point to an uninterrupted period of Teutonic success—a triumphal march leading on to the hegemony of Europe. This predominance has been achieved under the leadership of Prussia—Prussian policy, Prussian ideas have dominated the Fatherland—and modern Germany is, in fact, the creation of Frederick the Great. Bismarck, who is often credited with being the originator, was, in fact, really the reviver or interpreter of the State policy of Frederick. The principles which his master laid down the Iron Chancellor improved on. Take, for instance, these maxims from Frederick's great work (written in French) on "The Principles of Prussian Government":

Copyright, 1909, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Constant attention must be paid to hiding as far as possible one's plans and ambitions. Secrecy is an indispensable virtue in politics as well as in the art of war.

"If possible, the Powers of Europe should be made envious and be set against one another, in order to give occasion for a *coup* when opportunity offers.

"It is one of the first political principles to endeavor to become an ally of that one of one's neighbors who may become most dangerous to one's State. For that reason we have an alliance with Russia, and thus we have our back free as long as it lasts."

The determining factor in Prussian foreign policy was, of course, the geographical position of the kingdom. Having its origin in the military settlements of the Teutonic knights on the shores of the Baltic, right in the centre of the Slav population, which extended westward as far as the Elbe in the neighborhood of Hamburg, Prussia was military from its birth, and, as Frederick said, it had to be "*toujours en vedette.*"

The eighteenth century found Prussia hemmed in on one side by the Slav kingdom of Poland. Frederick induced Maria Theresa (in 1772) to join Prussia and Russia in despoiling that kingdom, and accordingly each of the great Powers took a slice of territory contiguous with its own. Twenty years later, in 1793, Russia and Prussia rounded off their territory with further acquisitions, leaving the kingdom a mere slip in the centre with nominal independence; but even this was forfeited in 1795, when Austria joined in the final partition. The kingdom of Poland disappeared and the king retired with a pension to St. Petersburg. The opposition of the Poles was by no means as strenuous as might have been expected from their past and their subsequent history; indeed, a faint pretence was made of consulting their wishes as to their annexation to neighboring states. In order to understand this apparent indifference we must recollect that the annexing Powers represented governments rather than nations, and that the Poles were, for the most part, dissatisfied with their own government. No idea of their denationalization was presented, and indeed under the crowns of all three annexing Powers they might have expected to find liberty and autonomy.

The greater part of the Polish nation found itself attached to Russia, and as the eighteenth century drew to a close the rise of Napoleon raised a fresh vista for the Poles. They saw, once more, the possibility of uniting their severed sections and regain-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing their lost provinces. Poland, before the first partition, had spread from the Baltic nearly to the Black Sea and from the Dnieper, on the East, to close on the Oder, on the West. French sympathy had been poured out for the Slavs in that burst of sentiment which followed the writings of Rousseau; and Napoleon, meaning to utilize the Poles against Austria and Russia, played upon their ambitions. The Poles schemed and plotted and hoped and fought brilliantly, and when their betrayal was at last plain they found they had squandered almost everything in this forlorn hope. Even in Napoleon's last campaign against Russia, after it had become apparent that Polish dreams of a revival of their ancient kingdom were illusory, the Poles fought desperately for him, and of the large number who went out it is estimated that not more than a few thousands returned. The Napoleonic creation of a semi-independent Poland took the shape of the so-called Duchy of Warsaw, which was carved out of Austrian and Prussian Poland. With his downfall the greater part of this Duchy was attached to Russia, under the title of the "Kingdom of Poland," with a separate government. Posen, however, was returned to Prussia, Frederick William III promising its citizens every consideration and liberty if they acquiesced quietly in their incorporation within his kingdom. Russia and Prussia now found themselves with that long coterminous frontier of which we shall speak later—not the frontier designed by Frederick the Great, but the one consequent on the redistribution after the Napoleonic wars. Polish independence survived, however, right into the middle of the nineteenth century, in the small neutralized free republic of Cracow. That ancient city, the centre of Polish tradition, became the rallying-point of Polish nationality, and from the first the great Powers were determined to crush it. As early as 1835 it was determined that Cracow should be incorporated in Austrian Poland, and in 1846 a rising in Galicia gave the desired opportunity and the republic was occupied and annexed.

Meanwhile the "Kingdom of Poland," under Russian rule, had also become dangerous. Had the more reasonable policy of later years prevailed at first, this "congressional kingdom" might have been the groundwork for Polish liberties. As it was, the Poles never abandoned the wild hopes raised in their Napoleonic days. They would accept no national ideal short of complete independence and the recovery of their former pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portions. In 1831 there was a futile and disastrous rising which ruined the chances of the congressional kingdom. The year of revolution (1848) found the Poles in revolt in more than one part, following the example of the rest of Europe; but, after 1849, until 1862, the more moderate party was dominant. Their policy was one of compromise. Hitherto no specially repressive measures had been directed against the Poles, but repression, of which Metternich had so long been the protagonist, was specially directed against all the peoples who had become infected with liberalism and cherished ideas of national freedom. The policy of Russia at the middle of last century was by no means in favor of severe and repressive treatment; and, in 1862, Gortchakoff, as the head of the "Old Russia" party and opposing the German or "Young Russia" party, was anxious to try conciliation on the Poles. He sent a Polonophil, the Grand Duke Constantine, as Viceroy, and a Pole of strong patriotic views, the Marquis Vielopolski, as Minister of Education, Justice and Public Worship. Vielopolski did not belong to either the "White" (or Conservative) Polish party or to the "Reds" (who were revolutionaries), but was in reality ahead of his times, believing that Poland could only secure the liberty of her people by recognizing Russian supremacy and working for autonomy and freedom of national speech and religion. This moderate programme did not meet the views of either party, and the conciliatory efforts of the Grand Duke and Vielopolski were met with attempts at assassination. Finally, the "Reds" became so influential that in the following year (1863) a great revolution broke out—the most brilliant and heroic, the most desperate and the last, of Polish efforts to regain their lost freedom. Foredoomed to failure, the revolt was prolonged by the almost superhuman efforts of the Poles.

During the period 1859-62, while ambassador at St. Petersburg, Bismarck had been closely studying the Slav question, and especially the Polish side of it, and, imbued as he was with the older Prussian traditions, had certainly thrown in the weight of his influence against the conciliation policy of Gortchakoff. When that policy had proved so total a failure, and Russian Poland for a time held her conquerors at bay, Bismarck came to the assistance of Russia. He says plainly in his Memoirs that his policy was to prevent any settlement of the Russo-Polish question, which would necessarily embarrass Prussia in dealing with her own

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Polish subjects; at the same time, he was prepared to incur, as he actually did, the reproaches of the whole of Western Europe, who were sympathetic to the Poles, to secure that alliance with Russia which Frederick laid down as essential to Prussian policy.

The result was disastrous to Polish aspirations, and, although the Prussian Poles were not to feel the hand of the Iron Chancellor as yet—occupied as he was with other problems—yet the beginning of the real persecutions of Polish nationality is found in the reprisals of Russia after the revolt of 1863. The language was forbidden in the higher schools; the Catholic religion—always a bone of contention between the Poles and their Orthodox conquerors—was subjected to disabilities; all government offices were closed to Poles; a bigoted Russian bureaucracy ruled the country with an iron hand. Fortunately for the Poles, this dark period was lightened by the good fortune which now befell that portion of their race which had come under Austrian rule. We have seen that Austria, after annexing Cracow, embarked on a policy of repression, and for some fourteen years the one idea was to sit on the safety-valve. But at length it became obvious to Francis Joseph that his throne could not rest any longer on this unstable foundation, and as a bold remedy he determined to adopt a constitution in place of his original autocratic form of government. The constitution of 1860 and 1862 aroused the hopes of the Poles of Galicia, but it was only after the defeat of Austria in 1866 that they were able to secure any real measure of liberty. They had suffered frightfully after the revolt of 1846, for Austria had called to her aid the Ruthenian peasantry of Galicia, who, hating their Polish landlords, were quite ready to join in a *jacquerie* and, being given a free hand, plundered and ravaged the estates of the Poles. The dislike existing between the landowning and peasant classes, between which the Jews act as intermediaries, is still a characteristic of Galicia. When Austria established a *Reichsrath,* in which all the subject peoples were to be represented, the Poles, being the educated and landowning class in Galicia, captured all the seats and, acting solidly together in Parliament, were able to sell their support to the Government (frequently hard put to it to get a working majority) for vital concessions in the way of autonomy. Consequently, the Austrian Poles are now freer than any others. They have their own Diet, a Polish Viceroy, police, government service and complete liberty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of language. The darkest period for the Russian Poles, therefore, synchronized with the dawn of hope in Austria, and the spark of nationality has not only been kept alive, but has kindled anew in the last forty years.

At Cracow the "Real" policy, which has been so successful in Austrian Poland, was initiated, and here the paper called the "All Polish Review" became the standard and rallying-point of the disinherited Poles. The main factor, however, in the development of Russian Poland has been the industrialization of Russia. Russian Poland contains iron and coal. She has become the *entrepôt* of a great trade, and a middle class and working class have sprung up of quite a different calibre to the aristocracy and peasants who formed the Polish nation of old. The consequence of this economic development is to make Poland and Russia mutually dependent, and to create a genuine bond. The downfall of France in 1870 helped to weaken the revolutionary movement, and modern Poland is represented in the Russian Duma by the National Democratic party, whose aims are not separatist, and whose policy is similar to that of the "Realists" in Austria in desiring autonomy and reform without revolution. So far the Russian Government has not met this conciliatory movement in a friendly spirit. The Poles, acting together, were able to acquire great influence in the first and second Dumas, and as a lesson to them their representation was cut down by half. M. Stolypin has considered their programme and declines to assent to it. Liberal opinion in Russia has hardly yet found a means of expression, but when it does it will certainly be found to be strongly in favor of conciliation to Poland—a policy already supported by many statesmen and publicists of all parties. The genuineness of the professions of the National Democrats as to their loyalty to the Russian Crown may be tested by the fact that during the period of revolution which followed the Russo-Japanese War there was no serious outbreak in Poland.

Bismarck, as has been said, was too much occupied for many years, even after the victories of 1870, to turn his attention seriously to the Polish question, but that he never lost sight of its paramount importance is shown by many references in his Memoirs. Polish writers declare that the partition of Poland would never have been consummated had it not seemed to Prussia that the Poles were on the point of developing those liberal ideas

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which had begun to spread from France. In 1848, say the Polish patriots, the Prussian Government actually encouraged the rising, and distributed arms from the Berlin arsenal to a Polish legion, knowing well that the Russian Government would take alarm at what appeared like an anti-monarchical movement. The Machiavellian design was to strengthen the hands of that party in Russia which was opposed to Pan-Slavism and to Liberalism, and in this, as we have seen, Prussia eventually succeeded. The scheme of Germanization devised by Bismarck was twofold, economic and mental, and aimed at reducing the number of Polish landlords and peasants and at banishing the Polish tongue from public life and from the schools. But not till 1873 did a definite policy shape itself as regards the language, and it was thirteeen years before Prussia was in a position to take measures for enforcing the scheme. One reason for this long delay (apart from the preoccupation of Bismarck with a succession of domestic difficulties —the *Kulturkampf,* the struggle against free trade, and the coercion laws against social Democracy) was undoubtedly the heavy expenditure involved by a project which amounted to nothing less than this—that the Poles should be bought out of their own country, and that such as could not be got rid of by these means should be deprived of their nationality by the simple means of making them speak German. The combination of a cultural and economic campaign was throughout Bismarck's idea, but it was only four years before his dismissal, when the Franco-Russian alliance was looming on the horizon, that the Germanization of the Polish provinces began in earnest and the Prussian Diet voted five millions sterling for the purpose of settling Germans in the Polish provinces and developing the country. In 1898 a further grant was made, and in 1902 the total was made up to twenty-two and a half millions sterling. The whole aim was to plant a prosperous and permanent German population on the soil, and thus to oust or assimilate the Poles. The eastern provinces were to be stamped deep with the Prussian impress. The policy was actively encouraged by Bismarck after his retirement, and Prince von Bülow expressed his belief in its importance in the striking sentence in his "Polish speech" of 1902: "I regard the Eastern Provinces question not only as one of the most important . . . but as eminently the one on whose solution the immediate future of our Fatherland depends."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What is the result of the determined effort to solve the Polish problem? Up to the end of 1906, after an expenditure of seventeen and a half millions sterling, it is estimated that not more than 75,000 acres have actually passed from Polish hands into those of Germans. The Poles have a Settlement Commission of their own, operating through their Land Bank, agricultural co-operative societies and other patriotic agencies, which are all prosperous business concerns paying high dividends. The price of land has risen to a point where the German landlords find it a great temptation to sell to the Poles, especially as they encounter hostility among their Polish neighbors. Any Pole selling to a German is ruthlessly boycotted. There are not wanting critics who declare that the Settlement Commission has been exploited by friends and relations with land to sell, and has besides consumed an enormous amount in salaries and working expenses; but, whatever may be the causes, the fact remains that one quarter of the National Debt of Prussia is due to the anti-Polish policy.

Meanwhile, the attempt on the Polish language has had little more success. All Europe was amused—and pained—at the spectacle of a great kingdom like Prussia fuming and fulminating with rage while 50,000 school children upset the whole course of law by refusing to say their prayers in German! The Polish population of the Ostmark increased ten and a half per cent. between 1890 and 1900, and since that date the Parliamentary vote cast by the Poles has risen rapidly, from 342,784 in 1903 to 453,774 in 1907. Socially, the Poles hold their own easily; and, owing to the boycott of German professional men and traders, a Polish middle class has risen and is prospering. Intermarriage means that the children, almost invariably, are brought up with Polish ideas. "Experience teaches," said Bismarck, "that a Polish wife makes her husband a Polish patriot in the twinkling of an eye." In short, we find this extraordinary anomaly—by no means rare, however—that the conquered race is proving stronger than its conqueror.

The latest move in the game is a Bill for compulsorily expropriating Polish landowners—an eloquent testimony to the failure of the more legitimate scheme. This Bill, which passed amid the execration of all men of liberal views, has not yet been put into operation, but the national policy is to be pursued "vigorous-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ly and persistently." Bülow's excuse for the Bill was that it was the only hope of introducing landowners of German nationality, but even this forced settlement will not insure the Germanization of these provinces, which the Royal Speech at the opening of the Prussian Diet on January 7th, 1907, declared to be "the historic mission of Prussia."

The vital nature of this problem to Prussia will be realized when one remembers the weakness of her eastern frontier—an artificial boundary of 750 miles (on a lowland plain, with no natural obstruction), coterminous with Russia. A wedge of Russian territory runs in at one point and the frontier here is only 180 miles from Berlin. A chain of fortresses has been established; but, to render these anything more than mere bases, the rear must be secured, and here is the immovable, hostile Polish population, which would be a factor of incalculable danger in case of invasion. Recognizing that Prussia could not satisfy her Polish subjects without disintegrating her own territory, Bismarck determined that the only safeguard was to see that the Russian Poles were kept equally discontented. How much of Russian policy has been suggested from Berlin may never be known, but the bureaucracy of Russia has also owed much to North German inspiration through the numerous Germans of the Baltic provinces who have taken service under the Tsar. The whole force of this influence has been reactionary, and Russian Liberalism has no greater foe, even in the autocratic circles of St. Petersburg, than Prussia, the head of an Empire once foremost in spreading Liberal ideas.

The part played in the Polish question by the recent development of the Pan-Slav propaganda is as yet obscure, but it is certain that Prussia will find it difficult to deal with this new phase. The old Pan-Slavist movement, with its ideal of Russia as the head of the Slavs — essentially an orthodox bureaucratic conception— found no echo in Polish breasts. It is said that certain tribes, hostile to each other under ordinary circumstances, will rally at the "call of the blood," and this is becoming more and more true of the Slavs as they achieve a fuller degree of national consciousness. The Poles, who cherished the idea of national independence until recent years, and who are Catholic and influenced by French theories of political life, could not accept the hegemony of Russia, even from a cultural point of view, so long as Pan-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Slavism meant a recognition of Holy Russia, orthodox and bureaucratic, as the Slav ideal. The modern Slav movement, however, known as Neo-Slavism, originating chiefly from Bohemia, is less political and yet more practical in design than the older propaganda. It constitutes a "call of the blood," but on broad grounds which compromise no national dignities and, instead of emanating from Russian official sources, it makes its appeal to Russian Liberals, who, in responding to it, have expressed their acquiescence in the claims of Poland to national liberty within the Russian Empire. A Bohemian delegate to the second Neo-Slav conference told his Russian hearers that justice to the Poles is essential to Slav unity and progress.

The apparent consolidation of the two great Teutonic States of Central Europe gives practically one Power stretching from the Baltic to the Adriatic, and possibly to the Ægean. The military efficiency, and the naval potentialities, of this alliance enable it to set on one side considerations based on those pacific *ententes* which of recent years have been multiplied in the hope of avoiding international collisions. Once more Europe is faced with the crude assertion that Might is Right, and the immediate result has been to plunge all the European nations into a sea of unrest. For a long period Austria, whose population is predominantly Slav, although her ruling House is Teutonic, has held the scales between Teuton and Slav and has thus preserved the balance of power. Now she has thrown herself violently into the Teutonic scale, and, having been the only Power to grant autonomy to the Slavs, is now posing not as a deliverer, but as an oppressor — for the Austrian policy in Bosnia - Herzegovina is definitely anti-national and oppressive. She is, in fact, committed to the Prussian programme. The other half of the Dual Monarchy, Hungary, is ruled by a Magyar oligarchy who in a mad fit of Chauvinism have so alienated their Slav subjects (also a large proportion of the Hungarian nation) that they are now bound to rely on German support or see "the Magyar State ideal" swallowed in the Slav sea by which it is surrounded.

This apparent solidarity of interest and purpose is all directed to the furtherance of Prussian policy. The Germany which existed before 1870, with its liberalism, pacific tendencies and high spiritual ideals, has disappeared before the march of industrialization, materialism and militarism. Prussia has dictated the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national ideals, as she dictates the foreign policy, of the German nation. With regard to the Slavs, we have seen that that policy has two canons—to divide the smaller Slav nations and to keep friendly with the big one. The latter half of this policy has only been possible because the Government of Russia has never represented the sense of the people. It is becoming increasingly difficult, and the humiliation recently inflicted on Russia was felt by both Government and people. The former may overlook it, but not the latter. The inherent weakness in the Prussian position is that it depends, in the long run, on the permanent subjection of that stubborn Slav race feeling which has survived centuries of oppression, and which in the process has learned how to hold its own in the teeth of superior organization.

Will the Slavs respond to the "call of the blood"? Whether or no, it is plain that the Polish question, the pivot on which Russo-German and Austro-German relations depend, is by no means settled, and still remains the Achilles heel of Prussia and of the Teutonic hegemony.

ARCHIBALD R. COLQUHOUN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NOVELS OF ROBERT HERRICK.

BY W. D. HOWELLS.

It would be easy, but I am not sure that it would be well, to count on the fingers of one hand the American novelists of a later generation than Mr. Henry James, who are at once moralists and artists, who set the novel of manners above all other fiction, and who aim at excellence in it with unfailing conscience. When I have generalized in these terms, I find that I have specialized, and without treading the devious and dangerous paths of comparative criticism have arrived at the work of Mr. Robert Herrick, which I prefer to consider positively. It does not stand alone; but it is quite sensibly part of what is alone vital in our imaginative literature; it is apparently, if not actually, the fulfilment of an ethical impulse effecting itself by means of truth to life, and by the study of character, serious, self-respectful, a little less lightened by humor than I could wish, but kept in its course by its constancy to a high purpose. It asks courage in the reader who shrinks from pain; but if he will once submit himself to its conditions, it will hold him to the last word with a grip on his interest which nothing merely amusing will lay. As I understand, this is what the reader primarily wants; but Mr. Herrick's fiction will do something more for him; it will keep him under its spell when he has shut the book. It will give him something to think about: himself, for instance, and his relations to other men very like himself in their common human nature. If his thoughts are not altogether pleasant, it will appeal to his sense of justice to declare why, and it ought to set him about seeing how he can make his thoughts pleasant.

The novels of Mr. Herrick, so far as I know them, are six; and none of them is unimportant. They relate, except the one which is least important, to Chicago, and they are mainly peopled

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by Chicagoans, especially Chicagoan women, either native or of that more Eastern or more Western derivation which somehow fails of making Chicago cosmopolitan. In holding the mirror up to Chicago, the author does not always show her a flattering image; but I should not be prepared to say from this fact alone that he showed her a faithful image. I find its truth in something less extrinsic, in the sort of assurance that an author cannot help giving you in his first page, unless he is an uncommonly clever trickster, that he is not faking. That is, not consciously faking, for there may be an essential artificiality in him, as there certainly is not in Mr. Herrick, which keeps him from knowing the real from the unreal, and so far absolves him of the sin against light and knowledge which is the worst of sins in a novelist. Mr. Herrick's work covers the ground covered by the work of Mr. Henry B. Fuller, of Mr. Will Payne, of Miss Edith Wyatt, and I dare say by that of other novelists whose books I have not read or not read so often; for the work of their Chicago group is so good that I like to recur to it better than to that of any other Americans now writing fiction.

The order in which I have acquainted myself with Mr. Herrick's novels is that of "The Gospel of Freedom," "Memoirs of an American Citizen," "The Common Lot," "Together," "Jock o' Dreams" and "The Web of Life"; but the fourth of these is the latest published and is quite new. All of them are modern in the full, frank and fearless spirit of their dealing with their material. The material will sometimes seem of its own choosing, but probably it is always the author's, and it is only one of the proofs of his skill in illusion that he should seem chosen by it. I do not say but it sometimes seeks its own ends beyond the scope of his primary intention, and in certain cases implies a precept where it was merely meant to offer an instance. For example, "Together" has to do with that new ferment of the old wine of individualism in women's character which is observable in their modern life, though not, I fancy, so often as our novelist appears to think. He may be painting moods, however, where he seems to be painting lives, when he portrays so many women loathing their husbands in the first moments of marriage, or getting sick of them as marriage keeps relentlessly on, and breaking from them at last in open or covert rebellion. In these appearances, if they are not realities, the book is franker than we once

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

supposed desirable for young people of their sex; details of emotion and behavior long blinked in Anglo-Saxon fiction are not spared; but it is to be noted in the book's behalf that the facts are recognized with a pathological decency. Yet there is one of these moods, or lives, or whatever, which will persist as question in the minds of those come to the knowledge of good and evil, and which I should not think it right in a critic to pass by. The question is whether a woman who despises the weakness or badness of her husband to the extreme of going off for several days and living with the man she has come to love, can be taken to have sufficiently expiated her sin by refusing, when left free, to marry the man she lawlessly loves.

One uses that quaint old word "sin," which has almost dropped out of our vocabulary, with a certain sense of its obsolescence, and perhaps of its original inaccuracy. Yet, with all its faults, one must still use it, for it indicates, if it does not strictly define, the sort of offence against morals which is not a crime. The offence is personal; and, so far as we know, the agency which we must still call "God" punishes it, just as crime is a social offence and Man punishes it, or vice is a physical offence and Nature punishes it. But a time seems to arrive when a sin can no longer be left to the sinner and his God, and when it becomes a social offence and man must punish it. Or, perhaps, not punish it; that is another of the troublesome questions; and generally man solves the question by wishing it could be left altogether to God. The freedom which the woman in "Together" won from her hateful marriage in the joy of her escape to her lover was that "freedom of the broken law" which Hawthorne recognized in its eternal impossibility as a part of conduct. So long as the law lasts, whether it is founded in God or founded in man, that freedom cannot be permitted without ruin. The law must be forever obeyed, or it must be forever repealed. It may be that the hour has come in which the woman shall say, when the minister asks her if she takes the man for her husband: "Yes, as long as I can I will love him; as long as I respect his mind and heart I will honor him; as long as I think him wise I will obey him. But when I cannot and do not, then I shall feel myself free to go away with some man whom I do love and honor and obey, for a day or forever, and I promise you that I will never have a moment's remorse from it." One may say, for argument's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sake, that perhaps it may be well so to amend the marriage vow; but, while the marriage vow remains as it is, and men and women take one another, for better or worse, till death do them part, then apparently the freedom of the broken law is the bond of iniquity. It is not less really so because it is not apparently so in the case supposed in "Together." Its motive is not altered by the circumstance that the woman is a woman of peculiar courage, courage enough to ignore the fact that she has dishonored her little son who loves her paramour and is equally loved by him and herself; her offence is the ranker for this reason.

One holds Mr. Herrick to account for greater clearness in this passage of his story, because of the absolute clearness of his meaning in the like passages of his other stories. I think he sees the social conditions, as regards the wilfulness and waywardness of women, rather redder than they are, or say yellower, for there is a strain of vulgarity in their aberrations which is very suggestive of a kind of modern journalism; and that, perhaps, he mistakes some of the tricksy

"Lights that do mislead the dawn"

of women's greater independence for the balefires of the Pit; and yet it is well to have inquired into the facts with unsparing fearlessness. It is ground in our fiction through which the pioneer must break his way, but it may be that it is time the way were broken. If Mr. Herrick is rather lonely in it as yet, he has company enough in the criticism of our economic and commercial life. It is already long since this was supposed to be without a close and constant relation to our spiritual life, and many of our novelists have already affirmed the contrary in saws and instances only a little too loud, a little too exceptional. What makes Mr. Herrick so useful in this field is his artistic self-control. Such books as "The Common Lot" and "The Memoirs of an American Citizen" strike me as scarcely amiss in any detail, and they are without the hectic flush which in an author imparts itself to his subject, and makes his reader doubt if it be the hue of life. The books are, of course, rather the more terrible on account of their quiet veracity; and their convincing power brings us to a wholesome shame for what we have so largely become. They are not only terrible, but they are terrifying in certain climaxes, such as that awful hour in "The Common Lot," when the architect

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who has "stood in" with the jerry-builder sees the victims of his fraudulent construction drop into the roaring volcano which his "fire-proof" edifice has become. As you look on with the wretched man, whose moral ruin has been so reasonable, so logical, you become one with him in your consciousness of like possibilities in yourself. When a novelist can do this with his reader, he has taken himself out of the category of futile villain-mongers and placed himself in the high, clear air where George Eliot discovered in our common human nature her immortal Tito.

It is grosser human material which the author deals with in "The Memoirs of an American Citizen," but the basis of the story is wider, and in its more inclusive portraiture of manners it is a greater book. When it need be fine, it can be so fine that it will bear microscopic examination, like those feats of Pre-raphaelite art which were as true whether you looked at them across the room or put your eyes close to them. The business career which is the theme of the epic is handled with as much skill in its implications as in its facts; the spiritual and material incidents are portrayed with an equal sense of their outer appearance and their inner significance. It is hard to say whether the autobiographic form of the story is altogether an advantage; the meaning has often to be suggested rather than expressed by the autobiographer's carefully guarded unconsciousness of it; that is a triumph for the author, but perhaps the triumph is less than he would have achieved in the historical form. That, however, is merely a technical question which does not concern the vitality of the book: what makes it so exceptionally vital is the insight with which it penetrates to so many recesses of so many kinds of American character, searching motive and tracing action to inevitable consequence. Men and women, old and young, high and low, in business and in pleasure, in commerce, politics and society, are seen and shown in that newer world of the West which is the heart of the New World now aging so rapidly into the image of the Old. The novelist paints human nature, which is forever the same and is forever changing to fit itself to the changing conditions for good as well as for evil. The persistence of the eternal ideals of right, even in the souls of them that do wrong, and are increasingly callous to the stings of conscience, is as evident in the autobiographer as in those who reject him in his hour of triumph and realize his essential defeat. The moral

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is worked out in no allegorical abstractions, but is shown in the very texture, the warp and woof of our life.

A signally uncommon touch of characterization is the autobiographer's recognition that in some points of conduct he may have been, or really was, rather awry, but that in broadening opportunity for thousands by increasing the general facilities, by promoting prosperity, and so "doing good," his merit has been greater than that of those who have merely kept themselves straight. He has been the agent, the ally, not to say the accomplice, the "pal" of Providence, and he knows it, whether Providence knows it or not. Still, he is not boastful; a man who has come from the farthest way back, and through a purely business career, has advanced himself to a seat in the United States Senate need not boast. A certain uneasiness rankles in him; but that cannot be helped, and that is all.

It is a grim book, and "The Web of Life" is a tragical book with as much fealty to truth and more final comfort. Public interests enter into it, as they do into nearly every book of Mr. Herrick's, but it is a personalized relation which its people bear to them. If I did not think so well of his other books I might say this was his best: there is a poetic sense of Fate in it, quite short of fatalism, and a pathos which the austere Nemesis of "The Common Lot," for instance, does not indulge. Mr. Herrick always, probably, evolves his characters with reference to their origin, which may be as simple as you like; he lets them keep their tradition, their conscious past, through whatever social successes tempt them or reward them; and we often see in them the truth noted by Mr. George Ade that "Chicago is a city made up of country people . . . a metropolis having a few saving virtues of a village." Such a saying is a key to the secret of what goes on in the minds and hearts of nearly all the people in "The Web of Life," and they are the more interesting because they have not lost the strong vitality deriving from the Indiana village or the Wisconsin farm. It is a great book, but sad, sad.

I might say the same things in different proportion of Mr. Herrick's other books. I do not know the order of them, but I should think "Jock o' Dreams" (which I like better by its second name of "The Real World") was the youngest of them. The scene for once is not in Chicago at all, but in a Boston suburb, in a Maine summer settlement, and in New York. It is so placed with-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out weakening the action, and with an advantage in the variety of types studied. The young people are especially well done, both the city and the country young people. The university impress in several of the young men, whether they have been of great or of no importance at Harvard, whether they are snobs or swells, is caught with skill; the hero is always truthfully and interestingly shown, and he is as new to fiction as he is true and interesting. One thoroughly likes him and likes to feel that he is the American stuff, as surely so as any character of Tourguenieff's is the Russian stuff; from the beginning to the end he is excellently ascertained. The heroine, if she is the heroine, the Europeanized Ohio village girl, who is untrue to her best in marrying money and to her worst in not being faithful to it, is never quite convincing, and at times in the supreme moments she is quite unconvincing. She is that phase of the eternal feminine which betrays the author in "Together" not merely to the excessive impartiality which I have noted in a particular case, but to what I think a strabismic vision of our woman-world.

It has not gone so far wrong as all that in its love or its lust of individuality, of self-worship, though it may be going that way. But there are many provisional and some final arrests, which Mr. Herrick has himself noted in "The Gospel of Freedom," and upon the whole I must regard that as his greatest book, greater in a wider if not deeper sort than "The Web of Life." It is not, to my thinking, more important because it deals with a woman of "higher" derivation; but it is the more notably successful, because it finds her and keeps her entirely human, which is more difficult with the women of our "world," East or West, than with the women of our life. There is not so much hurry, not so much intensity, as one is aware of in Mr. Herrick's more hyperæsthetic stories; he has not, apparently, so much to prove or to reprove; but the evidence and the penalty are clearly there. The well-born, well-bred and well-principled woman whose relation to art promises to be indefinitely amateurish, and who hopes to find her more vital and practical self in marriage with a business American after being his business partner, and who then abandons her failure and returns, returns in vain, to the life of sterile æsthetic enjoyment, this is the skeleton of a story which the art of Mr. Herrick has clothed in flesh and blood, and given veracity and constantly increasing significance. I do not remem-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber any point where his art played me false or descended for however good a purpose to dissembling. The people are such as from your experience of men and women you know to be veritable, and without being over-motived, they work out to the inevitable end. It is the highest privilege of the artist to take not only morally mean and nasty people, but dull and tiresome ones, and by virtue of showing their reality to make them interesting and even fascinating, as Mr. Herrick does in more than one book. The detestable little æsthete (who is the sole "hero" of "The Gospel of Freedom"), living upon the liberality of those who really love beauty more than he, without the expectation or promise of use in his study of the beautiful, is no more a triumph of that author's art than such a null and merely selfish woman as the heroine's mother, who seems merely to happen in it. But the highest triumph of all is the equilibrium in which it holds the reader's feeling toward the heroine. This is a balance which seems the effect of her own nature, and though it trembles now toward the squalor of moral ruin and now towards the pathos of innocent suffering, it does not finally incline towards either. She is what she has become: a woman who has sought herself and not others in what she has been and done, and who pays the cost.

In my sense of this fine art so strong and so definite, I am struck with the likeness between my author's extrinsic case and that of Mr. Leonard Merrick, the young English novelist whom I wrote of here some time ago. Each book of Mr. Herrick has had due recognition from criticism; his good faith, his rare power, his high purpose in each have been fully acclaimed, but he has failed of an assembled and united acceptance as one of the greatest Americans now writing fiction. Inferior names are more constantly the praise of the unanimity which is not the lasting majority; that is not so bad; but his name has not been of that thoughtfuller mention which his work has merited. That is, it seems so to me; but I am of the passing generation whose sight and hearing are not so good as they were; and it is very possible I am mistaken. I should be very willing to think so, and I put away gladly the misgivings which beset one when one has written warmly in praise of an author. I will still believe that with the one break noted in "Together" Mr. Herrick's fiction is a force for the higher civilization which to be widely felt needs only to be widely known. At the end I do not feel that I have said all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I might in its behalf: its good sense, its right-mindedness, its courage, its generous, its indignant impatience with our social and economic oppressions, its perception that the individual life is in no wise separable from the general life; and there is one fact of it which I wish still more specifically to note. If Mr. Herrick were older I should say he had learned from life how patient people are with disappointment, in the larger rather than the smaller experiences, and how beautiful and pathetic their resignation to fate is. As he is not an old man, but young enough to write many more excellent fictions, I must suppose that he divined the fact. What I should finally say of his work is that it is much more broadly based than that of any other American novelist of his generation. The fact is not affected by the other fact that it has not the same width above ground as below. It is founded in the universal passions and propensities, but the superstructure is rather of the exceptional than the universal experiences. This is in a measure inevitable. The novelist takes uncommon lives out of the common life; and if he is wise he shows them as instances, not as examples; but he must make this clear. If he is, like Mr. Herrick, a moralist as well as an artist this is especially his duty.

W. D. HOWELLS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MEDICAL EXPERT TESTIMONY.

BY ALPHONSO T. CLEARWATER, LL.D.

It is evident that the methods now pursued in admitting medical expert testimony in civil and criminal trials do not efficiently subserve the ends of justice. Briefly, they are that any party to a cause selects and pays his own experts, invariably selecting those who are willing to sustain his contention by swearing to opinions favorable to it. The expert, on being called to the witness-stand, is interrogated as to his knowledge of the subject, when and how he acquired it and the extent and character of his experience. If the Trial Judge concludes, as usually he does, that the witness is qualified to express an opinion upon the question involved, his ruling determines the expert's competency and the admissibility of his testimony so far as the trial at bar is concerned. The result is that many incompetent men are permitted to testify to crude and erroneous opinions—as, sometimes, the Trial Judge lacks the ability to distinguish the real from the masquerading expert; sometimes, possessing that ability, he lacks the courage to exercise it; and it has happened that the Trial Judge has not been unwilling that a brilliant charlatan should testify to the most reckless opinions, provided thereby public attention was directed to the trial over which the Judge presided.

In England and her colonial possessions much the same method is pursued. In Germany, medical experts are appointed by the Judges and are obliged to serve under a heavy penalty. They are allowed their expenses and a reasonable sum for their time and trouble, which is paid by the State. They are not looked upon as witnesses for either party, but as aids to the Court in ascertaining the truth. Their social position is much enhanced, and the fact that a physician or surgeon has been appointed as an expert to testify in an important matter is looked upon as official

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recognition of the high standard of his integrity and attainments. A similar course is followed in Austria, France, Italy, Spain, Holland and Belgium.

Both in England and America the existing method justly has been the subject of severe criticism by the Courts and the public, and attempts have been made to remedy it by Parliament and the Legislatures of some of the States. As a rule, these have failed because of the opposition of lawyers and physicians of secondary rank in both professions. The evils of the present system may thus be summarized:

1. There are no satisfactory standards of expertness, and thus the testimony of charlatans is invited;

2. The character of the evidence often given by so-called experts is partisan and unreliable;

3. Trials are prolonged and their expense is increased on account of the number of witnesses;

4. The contradictory testimony of experts of apparently equal standing, having the same opportunities for acquiring knowledge of the facts, has a confusing effect upon juries;

5. Unprincipled self-styled experts are sometimes unscrupulously hired to support causes by specious and untruthful testimony;

6. Some Trial Judges are prone to permit incompetent so-called experts to testify to opinions predicated upon widely unrelated facts, and to express views which are but the speculative vagaries of ill-informed minds;

7. The expert must depend for compensation solely upon the litigant for whom he testifies;

8. The litigant who has the longest purse can produce the most imposing array of experts;

9. The Bench sometimes permits the Bar to treat the accomplished and modest expert with studied contempt;

10. Some Trial Judges are disposed to convert important trials into spectacular dramas which not infrequently descend to comedy and degenerate into farce, with the result that the administration of justice is degraded.

Theoretically, an expert is a scientist solely interested in facts, who should retain absolute freedom of judgment and liberty of speech—which it is almost impossible to do where his emolument entirely depends upon the good graces of an employer. It is evident that the commercializing of scientific knowledge, where the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compensation for its acquisition and expression depends entirely upon the extent to which it contributes to the success of a litigant, lessens its accuracy and value. The opening years of the twentieth century witness an enormous development of and market for special knowledge. Controversy among experts thus becomes almost inevitable, especially under conditions where they lease their opinions, usually at a large price, to aggrieved and aggressive parties who may profit, either fairly or unfairly, by the doubts which they are deliberately employed to inject into the case. The increase in wealth, the multiplication of the wants of modern civilization, the colossal character of the interests daily requiring the arbitrament of courts of justice have resulted, therefore, in the gravest abuses in the introduction of expert, especially medical expert, testimony in testamentary and criminal causes, until it has come commonly to be believed that such witnesses are so biased that hardly any weight should be given to their opinions. As was recently said by the court of last resort in a New England State: "If there be any kind of testimony that not only is of no value at all, but even worse than that, it is that of the medical expert"; and by the Supreme Court of the United States: "Experience has shown that opinions of persons professing to be medical experts may be obtained to support any view."

The expert witness, to be free from embarrassment of any personal relations to or with the parties to an action, should have no client to serve and no partisan interests or opinions to indicate. He should give his opinion as the advocate neither of another nor of himself. When he speaks, he should speak judicially, as the representative of the special branch of science which he professes, governed by the opinions of the great body of authorities in that branch, and in accord with the result of their most recent investigations. When this is done, and not until it is done, shall we have expert testimony rescued from the disrepute into which it has fallen. By the adoption of some such system the mature judgment of the best minds could be obtained, and the superficial opinions of quacks and mountebanks would not be thrust upon the jury to their confusion and the hindrance of justice.

The testimony of witnesses who are brought upon the stand to support a theory by their opinions is justly exposed to sus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

picion. They are produced not to swear to facts observed by them, but to express their judgment as to the views held by those who employ them; they are selected to express an opinion valuable to their employers—an opinion, there is reason to believe, which is the result of the employment, the payment and the bias arising out of it. Such evidence always should be cautiously accepted as a foundation for a judgment; in many cases it has induced unwarranted verdicts, discreditable to the administration of justice and detrimental to the public interests.

Especially grave are the scandals arising from the prevailing methods in trials for homicide. Despite the veneer of modern civilization, there exists in many men a disposition to right their own real or fancied wrongs by brushing aside the slow methods of the courts and taking the law into their own hands. This is particularly true in cases where a woman is involved. Man is still primitive in that he clings to the primal notion that woman is a peculiarly precious kind of property, any interference with which deserves and demands the immediate and severe punishment of the aggressor; when a man kills the intruder he believes that his fellow men will exonerate him in their hearts, and that they will do so by their verdict if he can furnish them with a pretext for doing so. Thus lawyers, playing upon this ineradicable primordial instinct, advise the hiring of accommodating medical experts to swear to a flimsy theory of temporary mental irresponsibility, with the belief, predicated upon long experience, that the jury will seize upon it as a basis upon which to render a verdict of acquittal. No less scandalous is the abuse of medical expert testimony in contests, real or feigned, over the wills of wealthy testators, advantage being taken of the primal notion that a man's nearest connections by blood are entitled to his estate. Thus, if a man of large wealth, for reasons of controlling importance to himself, divides his property unequally between his children, or, failing children, bequeaths it to his widow, and religious, educational or charitable institutions, his will frequently is contested by relatives whom he scarcely knew, sometimes whom he never heard of, and to whom, had he known them, he would not have given a dollar. The contest usually is predicated upon allegations of mental incompentency or undue influence, but really it is based upon an appeal to the primal sentiment in favor of equal distribution between relatives of the blood. Not-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

withstanding the fact that over ninety per cent. of such contests are for purposes of blackmail, over sixty per cent. of them are compromised by the payment of a substantial sum to the contestant—the actual and legal beneficiaries too often being advised by conservative counsel that an unscrupulous adversary can hire abundant medical expert witnesses, of apparently fair standing, to testify to mental incompetency on the strength of the most trivial idiosyncrasies of conduct. The euphemism for this barbaric survival is "the unwritten law." Although, in both classes of cases, the medical expert is guilty of moral perjury and the lawyer who advises his employment is morally guilty of subornation of perjury, so common is the practice, so blunted are the sensibilities of the members of both professions and of the public that both the physician and the lawyer retain unimpaired their professional and social standing—in fact, they find more admirers than contemners because they profit largely by the performance.

The treatment of the fair-minded, thoroughly equipped man of science by the Bar and Bench cannot, however, be changed by legislation. Any improvement upon the existing method must originate with and be carried out by the advocate and the Judge themselves. Both profess a desire for reform, but neither as a body, until recently at least, has undertaken to bring about reform in anything approaching a systematic or effective manner.

It is evident that the personal embarrassment of having to proclaim one's self an expert, or at least a reputed expert, is enough to disturb the normal operations of any highly trained mind.

The Bar has cultivated and is largely responsible for the fallacy that a witness is to be discredited if he can be disconcerted ("rattled"). Thus the art of cross-examination, so potent for good when fairly and properly used, plays havoc with hard-earned and well-deserved reputations in the hands of lawyers whose sole ambition it is to win.

Scientific opinion, to be of controlling value, can be given only under conditions of mental repose. The haggling, sharp interruptions, uncalled-for wit, insolent comment and the other too common features of important civil and criminal trials, are not such conditions. While they put some witnesses on their mettle, they throw the majority and the more competent into a state of mind in which all sorts of stupidities may be expected.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Legislature cannot prohibit a party to an action from calling such witnesses to the facts of the case as he chooses, although it is within the discretion of the Trial Court to limit the number of expert witnesses; this discretion must always be judicially and not arbitrarily exercised, and, unless it affirmatively appears that it was abused, its exercise is not reviewable.

It should aways be borne in mind that the competency of a witness to testify to an opinion is a question of fact for the determination of the Court; but there must be a limit to the reception of expert testimony, for an army may be had if the Court will consent to their examination; and, if legal controversies are to be determined by the preponderance of voices, wealth in all litigations in which expert evidence is important may prevail almost as a matter of course.

If no limit be interposed, the little discrepancies that inevitably will be found in the testimony of those who in the main agree begin to attract the attention and to occupy the minds of the jury, until at last jurors, with their minds on unimportant variances, come to think that all expert testimony from its uncertainty is worthless.

Occasional lack of compentency and experience in judicial position is one of the misfortunes of our public life, but not less disastrous is the weakness of Judges who find it more agreeable to occupy the centre of a stage than to see that justice is carefully administered solely with regard to the rights of the individual and the State.

It is within the power of judges at *Nisi Prius* to require a greater degree of competency upon the part of persons claiming to be experts by the simple but effectual method of defining to a jury, with force and precision, the distinction between a witness proven to be thoroughly qualified to speak upon the subject regarding which his testimony is offered, and one whose claim to speak is predicated principally upon the fact that he is paid to do so.

If Trial Judges will pursue this course and are sustained in so doing by the Appellate Bench, courts of justice will be rid of corrupt and worthless so-called experts, provided the Judges themselves are animated solely by a wish to see justice properly administered.

Rhode Island and Michigan have attempted to remedy the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evil of corrupt and biased medical expert testimony by legislation; a similar attempt was made in Maine last winter, but an admirable law framed by Chief-Justice Emery of the Supreme Court of that State was rejected by the Legislature. At the annual meeting of the New York State Bar Association, in January, 1908, its then president, the Hon. Joseph H. Choate, handed to the writer a number of letters he had received upon the subject, and requested that it be brought to the attention of the Association. This was done, and the newly elected president, the Hon. Francis Lynde Stetson, appointed a committee of nine, one from each Judicial District of the State, to consider the matter, and to report to the Association at its annual meeting in January of this year. Of that committee I became chairman, and during my investigation of the subject corresponded with judicial and other officers in all our States, in England and the countries of the Continent of Europe, except Russia and Turkey. It is universally admitted that so grave a defect in the administration of justice should be remedied, and it is conceded that the defect is of such long standing that reform will be slow and difficult, largely because of the inertia of the Bar. I regret to say that I have found a greater degree of enthusiasm for better methods among physicians than among lawyers.

The Committee of the State Bar Association invited the cooperation of the New York State Medical Society (the allopathic school), of the Homeopathic Medical Society of the State, and of the New York Academy of Medicine. All appointed committees of distinguished physicians to confer with us. The result of our joint deliberation was approved by the Bar Association and all the medical organizations, and was presented to the Legislature of New York in the form of a bill which provided that the Justices of the Supreme Court assigned to the Appellate Divisions should designate at least ten, and not more than sixty, qualified physicians in each Judicial District who could be called as medical expert witnesses by the Court or by any party to a civil or criminal action, and who, when so called, should testify and be subject to examination and cross-examination as other witnesses are; that any designation might at any time be revoked without notice or cause shown, and any vacancy might at any time be filled; that when so directed by the Trial Court, witnesses so called should receive for their services and attendance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such sums as the presiding Judge should allow, to be at once paid by the fiscal officer of the County in which the trial is had, and that the act should not be construed as limiting the right of parties to call other expert witnesses as heretofore. The bill passed the Assembly, but failed in the Senate. It will be presented to the next Legislature, and it is hoped that it will become a law next winter. It is regarded by the Bench and Bar of many of the States as a long step towards the solution of a vexed and important problem.

There are cognate matters of which in passing it may be well to speak:

During and at the close of the trials of the People against Harris; the People against Patrick; the People against Molineux; and the People against Thaw, the newspapers (upon which in this century the majority of people rely for both facts and opinions) contained articles upon medical expert testimony, some of which were thoughtful and useful; many, although well intended, were lacking in accuracy; and a great number were replete with error—all doubtless were largely accepted as true. Among the erroneous views advanced were:

1. That the calling of expert medical witnesses is a custom of comparatively modern growth;

2. That the hypothetical question is a senseless, if not quite idiotic, method of obtaining the opinions of an expert:

3. That an admirable way of remedying the admitted evil would be to have the medical expert personally examine the subject, or, if the issue be insanity, the person involved, make his report to the Court in writing and have the Court submit the written report to the jury.

Fallacious as these views are known to be by the Bench and Bar, to a multitude outside the profession — perhaps to most laymen—they appeal with the force of fundamental truth.

A brief consideration of what is erroneous perhaps will not be amiss:

1. The custom of calling expert medical witnesses has the sanction of antiquity. By the Roman law, medical witnesses could be summoned by the judge at his discretion, and the Code framed by the Emperor Charles V, at Ratisbon in 1532, required the opinion of medical experts to be taken in cases where death was supposed to have been occasioned by violent means.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1606, Henry IV of France, in giving letters patent to his first physician, conferred on him the power of appointing two surgeons in every important town whose duty it should be to examine all wounded or murdered men and report thereon, and in 1692, by an order of the Council of State, it was ordained that physicians should be associated with the surgeons.

In England Mr. Justice Saunders said in 1553: "In matters arising in our law which concern sciences or faculties, particularly that of medicine, we apply for the aid of that science, which is an honored and commendable thing in our law, for thereby it appears that we do not despise other sciences, but we approve of them and encourage them as things worthy of commendation."

Cases are recorded in the Year Books from the beginning of the reign of Edward II (1307), to that of Henry VIII (1509), where the courts received the opinions of medical expert witnesses and of others learned in the sciences and arts.

2. The hypothetical question is the proper question to an expert. The criticism upon hypothetical questions addressed to expert witnesses is predicated upon a failure fully to consider or understand the reasons which require them. The ordinary witness testifies to facts, the expert witness to opinions. In testifying to a fact, a witness swears to something he has seen or heard, or the existence of which can be proved by the senses. An expert witness offers an opinion upon a given state of facts. He is not, and should not be, allowed to draw inferences or conclusions of fact from the evidence, nor is it proper to permit him to listen to the evidence of witnesses who testify as to facts and then to draw his inferences from so much of it as he can recall, because he may not be able to recall all the facts testified to or his construction of them may differ widely from the construction which should be put upon them. Therefore, when the facts are controverted, the only legal method is to frame a question upon the assumption that certain facts are true, and then to ask the witness, assuming they are true, his opinion regarding them. If the questioner exaggerates the facts or incorrectly states them, the opinion of the witness is of necessity erroneous, and the Court instructs the jury to disregard the opinion based upon them because the opinion is valueless unless the question fairly states and is fairly sustained by all the evidence in the case.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The form of question approved by courts is so shaped as not to give the expert any opportunity to mingle his opinion of the facts with the facts upon which he is asked to express an opinion. Thus, while a hypothetical question often seems involved, the method pursued is scientific and calculated to eliminate the element of error so far as it is possible so to do.

3. The suggestion that the evils complained of can be remedied by having the expert report to the Court in writing is untenable, because:

1st. The Sixth Amendment to the Federal Constitution and the Bills of Rights of the States provide that the accused, in all criminal prosecutions, has the right to be confronted with the witnesses against him;

2nd. Every party to an action, civil or criminal, has the constitutional right to call such witnesses as he may deem important to the maintenance of his cause, and the right to cross-examine those who may be called against him. In civil actions the deposition of witnesses whose attendance at the trial cannot be procured may be taken by commission, and on the application of the accused may so be taken in criminal actions, but the right to cross-examine remains.

It will be seen that Medical Expert Testimony long has been a necessary and always will be an important factor in the administration of Justice—the proper administration of which is the most important of temporal affairs. It will require time and effort to restore its sullied lustre, but the aim justifies the struggle.

ALPHONSO T. CLEARWATER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TRUTH IN REGARD TO THE WAR OF 1812 AND THE NECESSITY OF OUR KNOWING IT.

BY GENERAL GEORGE W. WINGATE, PRESIDENT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS' ATHLETIC LEAGUE.

THE editorial in the New York "Evening Post" of June 27th, 1908, denouncing the attempts of the Public Schools' Athletic League and of the National Rifle Association to instruct the boys of the High Schools in shooting with a military rifle, asks the questions, "Could the use of the rifle have any other effect than to stimulate the reckless use of arms by minors?" and, "What kind of patriotism is that which is to be acquired by going to a range and shooting at dummies?" This and a number of similar statements in otherwise intelligent periodicals, as well as much of the criticism of certain statesmen of both parties and other influential men on Mr. Roosevelt's anxious desire for four battleships, and against the recent law of Congress to put the National Guard of the different States into condition for service, and in particular, the persistent refusal of Congress after Congress to enact the military legislation urged by nearly every President, are largely based upon an erroneous idea which exists in respect to American success in the warfare on land during the War of 1812.

While the ordinary American is sufficiently familiar with the details of history to know that disasters frequently overtook our armies during the Revolution in consequence of the unreliability of hasty levies of untrained men, and that nothing substantial was accomplished until the organization of the Continentals (who were really regulars), yet few are aware that these disasters were repeated upon a much larger scale throughout the War of 1812. On the contrary, more than a majority of our people firmly believe that this war was on land, as well as on sea, a series of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"magnificent victories, won by inexperienced American citizen soldiers against superior forces of veteran British regulars." In fact, some fifty years ago there was a popular song which represented, and I think still represents, the sentiments of the people on this subject, the refrain of which was, "In 1812 we licked them well."

This erroneous idea has been strengthened by the similar idea which exists in respect to our Civil War, a war which the community generally associate with the victorious campaigns of Meade, Sherman, Sheridan and Grant, forgetting that they occurred at a period when the "mob of volunteers" of 1861 had been hammered into an army by years of actual conflict, at an enormous and largely unnecessary sacrifice of men and money, and ignoring the disasters and fiascos of 1861 and 1862.

The conviction as to our exploits in 1812 in "defeating foreign regulars with untrained American citizens," is not only prevalent, but constitutes a serious injury to the country in the influence which it exerts in preventing necessary military legislation to provide adequate means of national defence, and at present in leading many to oppose that instruction of our youth in marksmanship, not to mention military drill, which every soldier recognizes to be indispensable for the maintenance of the peace; for no country can expect to remain at peace unless it is prepared to defend itself in time of war. As we never will have a sufficient regular army to do this, we can only make up for it by training our youth to be such good shots that they will be formidable as volunteers. The Boer war showed what skilled riflemen could do even against regular soldiers.

It would seem to be timely, therefore, that some attempt at least should be made to state the truth in regard to the land campaigns of the War of 1812, the more so as many of the errors which occurred in them were not only repeated during both the Civil and Spanish wars, but there is every reason to believe will again appear in the next war in which this country may become involved—particularly the enormous loss of life which is certain to result in such a war from our insisting on limiting the medical service of the army in time of peace to one-third of what is required, with no provision for its expansion if war should come. This truth is that, while the work done by our little navy in the War of 1812 was a credit to it and to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country, the campaigns on land were a series of humiliating disasters, with the exception of the Battle of Lundy's Lane, Croghan's defence of Fort Stephenson, the victory of New Orleans, the Battle of the Thames and Jackson's defeat of the Indians. This arose from the following causes:

1. The Government had made no preparation for the war prior to declaring it.

2. After war had been declared, instead of enlisting troops for a term of years sufficient to ensure their becoming instructed and disciplined, the Government and the States put their main trust in the militia. This, it is fair to say, was not the present uniformed and drilled National Guard, but the "people at large," a totally unorganized body without military training, drafts from which were called into service usually for periods of from one to three months—too short a period to train men for effective service. It was, however, as much of a military body as the volunteers we should have to depend upon at the present time in case of war, outside our small regular army and the 115,000 National Guard of the States (assuming that the latter would all respond—a thing that it is impossible to expect). Its members could certainly shoot better than our volunteers would do under existing conditions, as our Spanish war demonstrated that the latter cannot shoot at all.

3. The officers, both of the army and the militia, were without military knowledge, and were usually appointed for political reasons.

4. The leading commanders who were not thus appointed were soldiers of the Revolution, who had become inefficient through age.

It is unnecessary to say that in consequence, in addition to the series of defeats which marked this war, it was prolonged very much beyond the time it should have lasted, and its pecuniary cost was rendered enormous.

These statements are so different from the idea generally entertained on the subject that they will be doubted by many. To establish their truth the following synopsis of the land campaigns in the war is given. It is taken from the "Military Policy of the United States," compiled by the late Major-General Emory Upton, a most distinguished soldier of the Civil War, who left it upon his death as a legacy to his country. It was published

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by the Secretary of War at the request of General William T. Sherman, who read and approved of it. It was republished by the War Department in 1907. All the facts contained in it are therefore officially vouched for.

The Forces Engaged.

War was declared on June 18th, 1812. At this time the British regular troops in Canada were less than 4,500 effectives. Even these were old men or invalids, fit only for garrison duty, as Great Britain had removed all her efficient troops to participate in the Napoleonic campaigns. Those left, however, were disciplined troops commanded by experienced officers. Although six months previously Congress had increased, on paper, the United States regular army to 35,000 men, at the time war was declared it was actually 6,744 strong. This army was poorly officered, there being at that time only seventy-one cadets who had graduated from West Point. There were no staff organizations, depots or supplies, nor, in fact, any real military organization. Many of the higher officers who had served with credit in the Revolution were now old men whose energy and initiative had gone. Notwithstanding the teachings of Washington and Hamilton, Jefferson and his successors in the Presidency, as well as Congress, had become imbued with the idea that a regular army would be a menace to the liberty of the Republic, and that the militia could be depended upon for its defence.

The greatest number of British soldiers ever in this country at one time during the war was 16,500 in 1814. In other words, while the population of the United States in 1812 was more than double that of the Colonies in 1775 and its wealth much greater proportionately, the largest number of British troops employed against it at any time in this war was only a little more than a third of those unsuccessfully used by the British in the Revolution.

Instead of falling upon the 5,000 British regulars who held Canada in the beginning and crushing them in a single battle, the want of a sufficient organized force caused the war to be prolonged until the American loss in killed and wounded numbered 5,614. The loss from sickness was over six times this number. It was very heavy among the Southerners who were sent to the Canadian frontier.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The number of troops raised by the United States during this war was:

Regulars (including sailors)	56,032
Volunteers	10,110
Rangers	3,049
Militia	456,463
Total	525,654

These figures, however, give no true representation of the actual force in the field at any time, as over 400,000 of these were enlisted for three months or less. With the slow transport of those days, by the time the men reached their rendezvous and had got a partial organization and a little drill, their time of service was about expiring and they had to be sent home. That this involved an enormous cost is self-evident. That such troops were unreliable as soldiers was proved by what took place.

The following is a brief history of the campaigns:

Campaign of 1812.

As soon as war was declared an outcry was raised everywhere that Canada should be immediately captured. Many attempts were made in this direction from different points, all of which were failures. These should be considered by localities:

In the West.—In July, 1812, General Hull crossed from Detroit to Canada with 1,800 men. Without inflicting any damage, he suddenly retreated to Detroit on August 8th, where he was besieged, and where, on August 16th, without firing a shot, he surrendered his entire force to the British, who had 320 regulars, 400 militia and 600 Indians. We thus lost control of the whole of the Northwest. General Hull had been a tried soldier of the Revolution, and he claimed that his troops were insubordinate.

On October 10th, 4,000 Kentucky mounted militia marched towards the Indian villages on the Wabash; but they became alarmed by a fire on the prairie, and on the fifth day abandoned their General and dispersed to their homes.

General William H. Harrison then organized about 10,000 militia from Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia and Pennsylvania for the same purpose. As soon as he marched, the want of proper supplies and the absence of discipline caused mutiny. After a slight engagement, the Virginia militia refused to obey orders and returned to their camp, which broke up the expedition.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Niagara Frontier.—On October 12th, 1812 (four months after the war had been declared, a period sufficient for the capture of Canada if we had had any army), General Van Rensselaer fought the Battle of Niagara with 900 regulars and 2,270 militia. He crossed the river and stormed the batteries. But, for want of proper support, the invading party, after a gallant fight, was driven from the batteries to the river and, being unable to cross, was captured. The total force which crossed did not exceed 1,000 men, and its loss was 250 killed and 700 prisoners. The British force was 1,100—600 regulars and 500 militia and Indians. They lost sixteen killed and sixty-nine wounded. This attack was made by General Van Rensselaer against his judgment, on account of the pressure of his officers and troops, who, however, refused to support him when the clash came.

General Smyth having raised 4,500 militia for a month, on November 28th, 1812, after a flowery proclamation, started to invade Canada, but returned the same afternoon. On December 1st, he crossed again, went a quarter of a mile and returned. His army then disappeared.

The Northern Army.—General Dearborn assembled near Lake Champlain another invading army, numbering 5,737, to capture Montreal. He made an advance as far as LaColle River, captured a block-house and then returned and went into winter quarters (where the troops suffered greatly). Nearly all the 3,000 militia included in the force refused to cross the line.

During the year, we called out 43,187 militia and 15,000 regulars, who, being opposed by 5,200 (counting Canadians, but excluding Indians), accomplished nothing. General Brown of our army estimated the British regulars in Upper Canada to be 1,200.

It is notable that at this time the President and his Cabinet had authorized the dismantling of the men-of-war of the Navy to convert them into floating batteries for harbor defence. They were only persuaded from carrying out this plan by protests from Captains Bainbridge and Stewart. The result was a series of glorious naval victories.

Campaign of 1813.

During this year Congress endeavored to raise more regular troops, but found it very difficult to do so, the war being unpopular in many sections.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Winchester, having taken up General Harrison's abortive attempt to relieve the settlers on the River Raisin, advanced with a force of some 900 men. He was attacked on January 22nd, defeated and captured by a British force of 1,000 men under Proctor, with a loss of 397 killed, 27 wounded and 522 prisoners.

General Harrison had entrenched himself on the east bank of the Miami at Fort Meigs. He was besieged by Proctor with 983 regulars and militia and 1,200 Indians. Kentucky militia to the number of 1,200 were sent to his support, but in disobedience of orders they attacked the British camp and were routed, only 150 escaping. Fort Meigs, although besieged, was not taken; but our losses were 87 killed, 189 wounded and 605 prisoners. The British lost 14 killed, 47 wounded and 40 prisoners.

On August 2nd the British with 391 regulars attacked Fort Stephenson held by Major Croghan with 160 regulars, but were repulsed with heavy loss. This was a creditable affair for us, particularly as Croghan was not twenty-one.

On September 27th Harrison, having received re-enforcements from Kentucky and Ohio, crossed to Canada and on October 5th attacked Proctor on the Thames and totally defeated him, with a loss of 12 killed, 22 wounded and 600 prisoners, all regulars. It was in this battle that Tecumseh was killed.

Harrison had a force of about 1,300. But instead of being sent forward to take advantage of this victory—which won back the territory we had lost and detached the southwestern Indians from the British cause—his army was disbanded. The militia was discharged and Harrison sent back to Detroit. His success, in contrast to the dreary series of disappointing disasters that had marked the war, justly gave him an enduring reputation.

In the Centre—In February, 1813, the British force in this section was estimated at 2,100 by the Secretary of War.

On April 27th General Dearborn advanced on York (now Toronto) and captured it, the American forces being 1,700 and the British 750 regulars and militia and 100 Indians. We lost 270, mostly by a mine explosion. The British loss was 200 killed and wounded and 293 prisoners. Dearborn took Fort George on May 27th, and later the other forts on the Niagara frontier. In one of the attacks an American force of 542 men, mostly regulars, was, however, surrendered because its Colonel believed he was surrounded!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A British attack, on May 27th, on Sackett's Harbor was repulsed with heavy loss by the regulars after a creditable fight. This, like all previous engagements, showed the value of disciplined troops, as the militia ran away after firing one volley. The fugitives who fled in panic to Kingston reported that the battle had been lost, which caused the burning of the naval barracks and stores—a serious loss.

The Failure of the Attack on Montreal.—To attack Montreal 8,000 regulars, under General Wilkinson, rendezvoused, at the foot of Lake Ontario, to descend the St. Lawrence, while another army about 5,000 strong, under General Hampton, was assembled at the foot of Lake Champlain. Though called "regulars," these were recruits without discipline or competent officers.

Hampton crossed the frontier, but was repulsed by a force of 800 militia and Indians, and he returned to Lake Champlain on November 11th. Wilkinson's advance of 1,600 men met 800 British regulars at Chrystler's Fields, whence, after a fight of about two hours, in which he lost 338 killed and wounded, our forces returned to their boats. A council of war then decided that the attack on Montreal should be abandoned and the army go into winter quarters on the American shore. Thus 13,000 men were beaten back by a force of regulars, militia and Indians not exceeding 2,000.

The Centre.—The British then threatened Fort George, the defence of which had been left to General McClure, who summoned a council of war, which decided that the fort was not tenable. Thereupon it was evacuated, and the force returned to the American shore, General McClure directing that the village of Newark be burned.

The British crossed the river on December 19th, captured Fort Niagara through the criminal negligence of the commander, and, in retaliation for the burning of Newark, destroyed Lewiston, Buffalo and several other towns. The inhabitants of Western New York fled, some of them as far east as the Genesee River.

General Cass wrote on January 12th, 1814, in regard to the destruction of Buffalo: "I am satisfied that not more than 650 men, of regulars, militia and Indians, landed at Black Rock. To oppose these we had from 2,500 to 3,000 militia. All, except very few of them, behaved in the most cowardly manner. They fled without discharging a musket."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Chesapeake Bay.—On March 4th, 1813, the British fleet entered the Chesapeake, and between April 20th and May 6th it captured and burned Frenchtown, Havre-de-Grace, Georgetown and Fredericktown. The landing party in each of these cases was composed of about 150 marines and a small detachment of artillery. On June 20th the British attacked Craney Island in the hope of taking Norfolk and its navy-yard, but they were repulsed.

On the 25th the British took and destroyed Hampton. Their forces consisted of 2,000 men; their loss was 48. The Americans had 450 militia, who lost 31. This, therefore, was a creditable performance by the Americans.

The Creek War.—On August 30th, 1813, the Creek Indians captured Fort Mims in Southern Alabama and massacred all in it, some 400. General Jackson was given command of 2,500 men raised by Tennessee. On November 3rd he fought the Battle of Tallasahatchee, and on November 9th crushed the Creeks in a second engagement. For want of supplies, however, due largely to the failure of the Government to organize properly the staff departments until hostilities had become imminent, Jackson was compelled to lead his troops back to Fort Strother. The militia resolved to go home, but they were stopped by the volunteers. Shortly thereafter the volunteers decided to imitate their example, but were stopped by the militia. Jackson then agreed that, if the supplies did not arrive in two days, they would all march back. When the time was up fulfilment of the promise was demanded, but the General said that, if only two men would remain with him, he would never abandon the post. One hundred and nine responded and were left as garrison; and Jackson started back with the remainder upon the understanding that if the expected supplies were met the troops would return. Twelve miles from the fort they met the supplies (cattle), but the troops refused to obey the order to return. They were compelled to do so by Jackson, however, who seized a musket and barred the homeward road of the mutineers. This ended "the glorious record" of 1813. During the year we were expelled from Canada and our villages on the northern frontier were destroyed.

Campaign of 1814

At the expiration of their terms of enlistment Jackson's soldiers left him and were replaced by new levies, so that it was not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

until the 6th of February, 1814 (a loss of six months), that he found himself at the head of an army of 5,000 men. With 3,000 of these he attacked the Indians at Horse Shoe Bend on March 27th, 1814, and destroyed them.

In 1814 Congress, for the first time, showed common sense by extending the term of enlistment in the army to five years. But while it offered a bounty, the amount was less than the States were offering to substitutes, and it was therefore difficult to recruit the regulars. The increase in bounties, as was shown during the Revolution and also during the Civil War, led to desertions.

The regulars during the winter and spring of 1814 were much improved, commanders like Scott and Brown personally teaching their officers the elements of drill so that they might instruct their men. The old incompetents, like Wilkinson and Hampton, were displaced.

In July our army crossed the Niagara; took Fort Erie; gained the victory of Chippewa; fought the drawn battle of Lundy's Lane; fell back on Fort Erie, where it was invested; raised the siege by a successful sortie, and returned to the American shore after demolishing the fort. Although the invasion was a failure, the conduct of the army was entitled to the highest praise.

At the Battle of Lundy's Lane the British force was 5,000; the American, 3,000. The British lost 878; the American regulars, killed and wounded, 691; the volunteers, 57; a total of 748.

This was about the first occasion during the war when the American troops put up a square obstinate fight in the open against the British regulars. While both sides retreated after the engagement, in view of the difference in strength the engagement is regarded as an American success.

On the Northern Frontier.—On March 30th, 1814, Wilkinson, with nearly 4,000 regulars, invaded Canada, but was checked by 180 men stationed in a stone mill; and, after sustaining a loss of 154, he retreated to Plattsburg and then retired from the army.

In August, the British were preparing to advance up Lake Champlain and Plattsburg was threatened. In spite of this, by orders from the Secretary of War, General Izard's force of 4,000 men on August 29th marched from Plattsburg, where their presence was indispensable, to Sackett's Harbor, where there was nothing requiring their presence.

On September 11th the Governor-General of Canada at the head

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of 11,000 British veterans, who had arrived during the summer, mostly from the Spanish Peninsula, attacked Plattsburg, but the total destruction of his fleet by Commodore McDonough broke his line of communications and compelled him to return to Canada. The depleted American force in Plattsburg was then 3,500. The only thing that saved it, and, in fact, saved New York from the invasion of the British forces was the success of the navy.

It is noticeable that on this occasion, when the cannonading was distinctly audible at Burlington, Vermont, Governor Chittenden, of that State, refused aid to the American forces upon the ground that he had no authority to order the militia to leave the State. A number of the Vermont militia crossed and participated in the fight at Plattsburg in spite of his opposition.

The Capture of Washington.—Although the British fleet, with about 3,000 troops on board, had been hovering along the shores of the Chesapeake for nearly a year nothing was done to protect Washington until the beginning of the summer of 1814. The Secretary of State then ascertained that the regulars in Maryland and Virginia were but 2,208, composed largely of recruits, who were dispersed at various points from Baltimore to Norfolk. This situation was presented to the Cabinet on June 7th, but no action was suggested.

On July 2nd the Tenth Military District was created, comprising Maryland, the District of Columbia and a part of Virginia. The command of this district was given to General Winder, not because he was distinguished professionally, but because he was a native of Maryland and a relative of the Governor and "thus would be useful in mitigating the opposition to the war"—in other words, for his political influence.

On July 4th the Governors of States were requested "to hold in readiness for immediate service" 93,500 men. It was considered too expensive to actually call them out!

General Winder, who had but 700 or 800 regulars, asked that 4,000 militia should be called out and stationed to protect Washington. Finally, on August 13th, after he had been authorized to make a call for 15,000 men and had done so, the militia who responded were mustered on August 21st. This army was 5,401, of whom 400 were regulars, 600 marines, 20 sailors, the remainder being volunteers and militia. Its commander says it was "suddenly assembled without organization or discipline, or officers of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the least knowledge of service." On August 24th, three days after its muster, it was attacked by an advance division of 1,500 men out of a British force of 3,500, and was routed with a total loss of but 8 killed and 11 wounded!

It is noticeable that the men who participated in this panic, as well as those who were involved in the other humiliating disasters mentioned in this article, were in all respects, except discipline and competent officers (two vital exceptions), the same as those who fought in the Battle of Lundy's Lane, and there, out of 3,000 men, 76 officers were killed or wounded and 629 rank and file, and they "held at bay in the open field 5,000 British regular troops."

After the "Bladensburg Races," the British continued their march, captured Washington, burned the White House, the Treasury and the War Offices, and the next day returned unmolested to their shipping.

This scandalous disaster was largely due to the cheese-paring economy of Congress and the President, who refrained from calling out the militia for drill and organization until the time when they were required to fight without them. It resulted, however, in driving from office the Secretary of War, who had undertaken to manage the war himself and to give direct orders to the different commands.

On September 13th the British made a combined land and naval attack on Baltimore, but were driven back with a loss of 319.

During 1814 we called out 38,186 regulars, 197,653 militia, a total of 235,839, against 16,500 British. The utmost strength we could show in the shape of an effective force in battle was 3,000 at Lundy's Lane.

Campaign of 1815

The only engagement of this campaign was the victory of New Orleans, which was won on January 8th, two weeks after the conclusion of the treaty of peace. The British had a force of 14,250 regulars, veterans just sent from England; General Jackson had 5,698 volunteers. The actual attack was a frontal one, made by the British with 8,000 men against strong entrenchments; the British lost 2,100 killed and wounded and 500 prisoners; the Americans 7 killed and 6 wounded. This result was largely due to the indomitable energy of General Jackson, and the remainder

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the wonderful marksmanship of his Kentucky and Tennessee troops, most of whom, it must be remembered, had acquired considerable military experience in the warfare against the Creeks. As Henry Clay, however, said, "It wound up a disastrous and humiliating war in a blaze of glory!" This gave General Jackson a popularity among the masses, which, as was said at the time, "would stand anything." Although there were many who, during his stormy career, differed with him upon political questions, the number of those who could be induced by such differences to vote against "the hero of New Orleans" were few.

The Financial Loss.

The expenses of the War Department during these three years of futile war were $82,627,509.44, which was more than twice what had been spent upon the Army during the twenty-five years preceding 1812. Those of the Navy were $30,286,534.44. The pension bill up to 1903 was $45,186,197, although the people felt so sore over the results that it was not until 1871 that a pension law was passed affecting the soldiers of this war, except those that were disabled. General Upton figures the total cost of this war to have been $198,000,000, excluding pensions.

If Congress had applied a small part of this sum from 1808 to 1811 to maintaining an army of 15,000, capable of being expanded, Canada would have been ours and the war would have been ended in a single campaign. The loss sustained from the failure to acquire Canada is incalculable. In view of this humiliating record, can any lover of his country or any man of common sense question the wisdom of Messrs. Root and Taft, or of Mr. Roosevelt, not to mention the Public Schools' Athletic League and the National Rifle Association, in endeavoring in time of peace to prepare the United States for defence in time of war, or continue to entertain the idea that numbers of untrained men, without skill in marksmanship, make an army, or can defend the country against a small force of well-disciplined and well-officered foreign regulars?

GEORGE W. WINGATE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRIVATE PROPERTY AND PERSONAL LIBERTY IN THE SOCIALIST STATE.

BY JOHN SPARGO.

I.

THE most persistent and wide-spread antagonism toward Socialism springs from a belief that, under a Socialist régime, private property in all its forms would be destroyed and personal liberty made impossible by the rule of an immense bureaucratic government. All other objections, it may be said without denying their force, are subordinate to these two.

The modern Socialist, whether dogmatic Marxist or neo-Marxist, indignantly denies both charges contained in this criticism. The greater its persistence, the greater his vehemence. Not unreasonably, he claims the right to define the Socialist ideal in which he believes and to interpret it in his own way: he refuses to accept the *dicta* of the enemies of Socialism as to its meaning. But, in spite of indignant denials, the criticism prevails.

For the almost universal prevalence of this criticism there must be some other reason than malice on the part of the critics. Underlying the seeming malevolence there is always a very real belief in the disaster to the institutions of private property and personal liberty which must attend the triumph of Socialism. Instead of hatred creating the belief that a Socialist régime is incompatible with personal freedom and with private property, the belief, deep-seated and sincere, however mistaken it may prove to be, creates the hatred. It must be remembered, also, that the belief is not confined to the malevolent opponents of Socialism and Socialist aims. Many who are very sympathetic toward the movement and the ideal, a great army of the "almost persuaded," are held back from giving their adherence to the movement through fear that the criticism is well founded.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The existence of such a widely prevalent belief must be the result of causes inherent either in the principles of Socialism or in the history of the movements based upon those principles. It is, therefore, only just that the Socialist, when he makes his sweeping denial that Socialism involves the suppression of private property and personal liberty, should be asked to explain the persistence of the fear he declares to be groundless—and this only as a prelude to an equally just demand for a reasoned statement of his own faith, so different to the unfaith of the world.

The frank and sincere Socialist will be slow to attribute the criticism to malice. He will, on the contrary, be disposed to admit that it is a perfectly natural result of certain phases of the evolution of Socialism and the development of its propaganda. He will admit, with entire good faith, that Socialists have given their opponents ample warrant for believing that with the coming of Socialism private property and personal liberty must cease. No small part of the work of the Socialists of to-day consists in undoing the work of an older generation of Socialists.

Proudhon's famous dictum, "Property is robbery," and its counterpart, "Property-holders are thieves," have been so many times reiterated by Socialists, and so often inscribed upon their banners, that no sort of blame attaches to those persons who, taking the words at their face-value in the currency of human speech, have concluded that Socialism must abolish all kinds of private property. Phrases like "the socialization of property" abound in the literature of Socialism, and in more than a few Socialist programmes, issued in this country and elsewhere, Socialism is objectively defined as "the social ownership and control of all the means of production, distribution and exchange." The definition certainly justifies the belief that the existence of a Socialist state depends upon the abolition of private property.

II.

Taking the definition literally, it is evident that under Socialism nothing which could be used as a means of producing or distributing wealth could be privately owned. No man could own a spade, a hammer or even a jack-knife, for these are all instruments of production. No woman could own a sewing-machine, or even a needle, for these are tools, means of production. No man could own a wheelbarrow, no woman could own a market-basket,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these being "means of distribution." The differences between a spade and a steam-plough, between a market-basket and a delivery van, are differences in the degree of their efficiency merely.

Now, it is quite evident that, if we are to accept this definition literally and to regard "the social ownership and control of *all* the means of production, distribution and exchange" as a *sine qua non* of Socialism, we must accept the verdict that it would destroy the institutions of personal property and liberty. The amount of property which would not come within the scope of the classification, "all means of production, distribution and exchange," is almost a negligible quantity, and it is certain that such a vast bureaucratic system of government would be needed as would practically extinguish personal liberty. It requires little imagination to see how intolerable the despotism would be if needles, spades, sewing-machines and market-baskets were to be under the control of governmental bureaus.

But, when challenged upon this important matter, the modern Socialist denies that the social ownership and control of *all* the agencies of production and distribution is a *sine qua non* of Socialism. He denies that his aim is anything of the kind. Socialism, he says, implies the social ownership and control only of certain kinds of property, certain very definite categories of productive and distributive agencies. Under Socialism, as he conceives it, private property would coexist with social property. Indeed, his claim is that Socialism, in very important respects, would extend both private property and personal liberty.

Therefore, the question arises: What things, under Socialism, will it be necessary to socialize and what to leave in the hands of private owners?

The reply to this question may take either of two forms: either we may attempt to catalogue the things which would have to be socialized in order to realize Socialism—a stupendous task—or we may attempt to state the principle of differentiation in a manner permitting its ready application to any form of property, at any time, and in any place. This latter is, indeed, the only practical method of dealing with the question. Not only is the former method a cumbersome one, involving the gigantic task of making an inventory of all kinds of property, but endless revision of the list would be necessary to make it conform to changing conditions and to the needs of particular localities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

III.

Preliminary to the attempt to state the principles of differentiation, however, a brief discussion of the nature of property seems to be necessary. If we ask ourselves, What is Property? and, instead of repeating Proudhon's classic epigrammatic reply, attempt to answer the question with the seriousness it demands, we shall soon discover that much of what we have regarded as a concrete entity is, in fact, a mere abstraction: that property is not a tangible thing, in a vast number of instances, but an assumed relation. We shall discover, too, that there are no absolute property rights anywhere.

While it is true that the recognition of private property marks the emergence of mankind from savagery, and that civilization is commonly said to rest upon that recognition, the paradox is nevertheless true that civilization and private property, in an absolute sense, are incompatible. The jurisprudence of all civilized countries rests upon the repudiation of absolute property rights of any kind whatever. Taxation is, of course, a familiar example of the collective disregard of private property rights. All kinds of property have been subjected to taxation, the collective authority exercising the right to take any part of any man's property, or even the whole of it. Henry George's proposal to impose a tax upon land values equal to the sum total of such values is a perfectly logical extension of the principle of taxation. A few years ago, the city council of Copenhagen, Denmark, applied the method to the street railways of that city with entire success, so that the owning companies were glad to surrender the lines.

The powers of domain and ultimate ownership which underlie the jurisprudence of every civilized nation prove conclusively that there is no allodial property in land, nor any form of absolute private property. A state or municipality desires land which is the "property" of one of its citizens for some public purpose, such as building a hospital or a bridge, making a park or a roadway. The "owner" of the land does not agree to sell it, whereupon the state or the municipality takes the land from him—often at its own valuation! Even when the land is needed by a quasi-private corporation, such as a railway company, the collective power is used to take away the ownership of the land from one citizen and transfer it to others.

It is very commonly assumed that this power of ultimate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ownership resting in society, through its government, applies only to land; but, in fact, no form of property is exempt from it. Not only may all forms of property be taxed, but likewise all forms of property may be sequestrated. The power exercised in times of martial law, of seizing food and other supplies, is an example of this. Under the police powers of all civilized communities, in case of serious accident or disaster, the home of any person, and anything it contains, may be lawfully seized and used. Suppose that, during the San Francisco earthquake and fire, the "owner" of a supply of food or drugs, or any other vital necessity, should have clung to them, asserting his "ownership," does any sane person believe that he would have been permitted to enforce his sacred "rights" against the need of the community? Nothing, not even one's pocket handkerchief, can be said to be exempt from this ultimate power of society. If, therefore, one's handkerchief is not taken away from him, it is simply because the community does not desire to take it. In the last analysis, private property is an abstraction. It consists of nothing more than a relation between the community and the citizen, and rests upon nothing more tangible than community good-will.

Furthermore, in the development of capitalist society the *substance* of private property tends to disappear, quite irrespective of the enforcement of the ultimate powers of ownership by society. Prior to the formation of joint-stock companies, in the era of individual capitals, the investor who invested his money in a ship or a factory could say that the ship or the factory belonged to him. But with the coming of the joint-stock company and the development of the great industrial corporations, that could not be said. Suppose X to be a shareholder in a corporation which owns a cotton-mill. There are a thousand shareholders owning between them the ten thousand shares of stock of the corporation. X owns ten shares. But he does not own a one-thousandth part of the physical properties of the cotton-mill in any real sense. He could not, for instance, go into the mill and say: "Here are a thousand looms: one belongs to me. I will take it away."

What X really owns is a one-thousandth part of every brick in the building, not a single whole brick; a one-thousandth part of each cog in every machine, but not a single whole wheel; a one-thousandth part of every yard of cotton, but not a single yard of actual cotton. X could not realize his own property, separate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it from that of the other nine-hundred and ninety-nine shareholders and do as he pleased with it. To get at his one-thousandth part of a brick, he must destroy the whole brick. To actually realize his own property as a physical entity, he must destroy it and the property of his fellows. And then, paradoxically (for the whole capitalist system is a paradox), he does not realize it at all. When he has destroyed the brick and extracted his one-thousandth part of it, he does not own a one-thousandth part of a brick, but only some fragments of burned clay.

However we look at it, private property under our present social system is an abstraction. The property of the citizen in the immense assets of the State of New York, or of the United States, is just as real as the property of the shareholder in the United States Steel Corporation. But there is this important difference, that the citizen's share is not negotiable; it may not be transferred. It cannot be gambled with in the market, whereas that of the shareholder in the corporation may be and commonly is.

IV.

Collective ownership is not the ultimate, fundamental condition of Socialism. It is proposed only as a means to an end, not as an end in itself. And that end, to the attainment of which collective ownership is the means, is the fundamental condition of Socialism. The central idea of modern Socialism, its spirit, is the doctrine of the division of society into antagonistic classes. The producers of wealth are exploited by a class of capitalists draining from them a "surplus value," and, instinctively, they struggle against the exploitation, to reduce the amount of the surplus value taken by the capitalists to a minimum—ultimately to zero. To do away with that exploitation, to destroy the power of one class to live upon the labors of another class, is the Socialist aim. Social ownership and control are only proposed as means to the attainment of that end. If other means toward that end, quicker, more efficient or more certain means, can be found, there is nothing in Socialism to prevent their adoption.

It follows, therefore, that to make collective property of things not used to exploit labor does not, *necessarily,* form part of the Socialist programme. It is easy to see that, according to this principle of differentiation, it would be necessary to socialize the railroads, but not at all necessary to socialize a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wheelbarrow. It is not difficult to see that a woman might support herself through the possession of a sewing-machine who would otherwise be obliged to submit to exploitation as a factory worker. To secure her the ownership of the machine would, therefore, be no departure from Socialist principles. On the contrary, in her individual case, the aims of the Socialist would be realized in that she would be placed beyond the power of the exploiter of labor. Similarly, in the case of the farmer with a small farm, and of the craftsman with his own tools, or of groups of workers working co-operatively, there is no exploitation; no surplus value is extracted from their labor by any outside parties. Consequently, being neither exploited nor exploiters, their independent self-employment is quite consistent with Socialism.

As the Socialist movement has outgrown the influence of the early Utopians, which touched even Marx and Engels, it has given up the old notions of a regimentation of labor under the direction of the State. It is increasingly evident that the Socialists of to-day have abandoned the habit of speculating upon the practical application of their principles in future society. They are insisting more and more that Socialism be regarded as a principle —namely, the conscious elimination of the power of an idle class in society to exploit the wealth-producers. Whatever tends toward that end of eliminating the exploiter from society contributes to the fulfilment of the Socialist ideal.

Instead of the old contention that, in order to have Socialism, every petty industry must be destroyed by the power of great industrial corporations, and every small farm swallowed up by great bonanza farms of vast acreage, it is now recognized by most of the leading exponents of Socialism in this country and Europe that the small workshop and the small farm may enter very largely into the economic structure of the Socialist State. The small farm has thus far proved capable of more economical cultivation than farms of immense acreage; and it may be, as some authorities contend, that small workshops will prove quite as economical as, or even more economical than, great industries when the thousand hampering restrictions and discriminations and privileges which favor their greater rivals are removed.

Should this prove to be the case, there would be nothing to prevent a process of decentralization of industry taking place under Socialism; a process of decentralization so far-reaching

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that private ownership and individual production would be much more diffused than now. The participation of the State in industry would be confined to the operation of railroads, mines and other great natural monopolies, and to the carrying on of the great fundamental public services which rest upon natural monopolies, leaving to individual enterprise and voluntary co-operation vastly more scope than these enjoy to-day in production and distribution. Needless to say, this is not a prophecy, but simply a statement of possibilities.

The important point to be remembered is that there is no principle of scientific Socialism which is opposed to the continuance of private property or private industrial enterprise, so that it involves no exploitation of the laborer by the non-laborer. It needs but the statement of this principle to demonstrate its truth. B is a farmer, working upon his own small farm. He exploits no man's labor, but manages to maintain himself and family in comfort. C is a shoemaker, owning his own little shop and his own tools. He, also, exploits no man's labor, but manages to support himself and his family comfortably. What reason could the State have for forbidding these men to employ themselves, denying them the right to exchange their products, shoes for farm produce, and compelling them to enter industrial or agricultural regiments as employees of the State?

Socialism, it cannot be too strongly emphasized, is not the fulfilment of a great plan of social organization, the principal feature of which is that the State owns and controls everything and aims to administer things with approximate equality of benefits and duties. It is an ideal, objectively considered, of a society in which there is no parasitic class preying upon the wealth-producers. Subjectively considered, it is a struggle on the part of the producers to throw off the exploiters, the parasites, in order that the ideal may be attained.

Of course, under Socialism, as in every civilized society, private property of all kinds would be subject to the ultimate rule of society. The interests of society as a whole, that is to say, would be regarded as superior to those of the individual. Subject to this superior social right, there is no reason why private property should not be far more wide-spread under Socialism than to-day. Take, for example, the matter of homes. The great mass of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

people do not own their own homes, though there can hardly be any question that the great mass of people desire to own homes of their own. It is conceivable that in a Socialist state of society every person who desired it could own a home for himself and family. On the other hand, it is not conceivable that the State would have any interest whatsoever in forbidding the ownership of homes. Since all families must have homes in which to live, whether provided by the State or otherwise, there could be no reason for the State's insisting upon being the universal landlord. Government ownership of dwellings in preference to the ownership of the dwellings of the many by a few extortioners, certainly: but there is no more reason, so far as the central principle of Socialism is concerned, for denying the right of a man to own his home than there is to deny him the right to own his hat.

V.

From the foregoing it will be seen that not only does Socialism not involve the abolition of all private property, but that, on the contrary, a wide extension of private property is quite compatible with Socialism as taught by Marx and his followers. It is not an insignificant thing that the Socialist party of the United States, in its national platform of 1904, charged that "Capitalism is the enemy and destroyer of essential private property." The Socialist protest against capitalism is that it destroys the economic independence of the producers. The restoration of that independence is the grand aim of all Socialist endeavor.

Failure to recognize with clearness the principle set forth in the foregoing pages produces inability to distinguish between Government ownership and Socialism. Many persons marvel that the Socialists do not hail with gladness, and join forces with, the various movements aiming at public ownership as they arise, and thus achieve Socialism piecemeal. Every proposal to extend the area of Government ownership and management is at once hailed as a "step toward Socialism." For example, a strong movement arises for the Government ownership of interstate railroads, or of the telegraph systems, and people wonder that the Socialists preserve their equanimity, stand aloof, apparently unconcerned, and decline to join the movement. Such persons confound—as many Socialists do—the external forms of the Socialist programme, its non-essentials, with its fundamental, essential prin-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciple. They do not see that the form of ownership is relatively unimportant according to the Socialist philosophy.

It is quite as possible for a Government to exploit the workers in the interests of a privileged class as it is for private individuals, or quasi-private corporations, to do so. Germany with her state-owned railroads, or Austria-Hungary and Russia with their great Government monopolies, are not more Socialistic, but less so, than the United States where these things are owned by individuals or corporations. The United States is nearer Socialism for the reason that its political institutions have developed farther toward pure democracy than those of the other countries named. True, in Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia and other countries of the Old World, there is a good deal of Government ownership, but the Governments are class Governments and the workers are exploited for the benefit of the ruling classes. Obviously, the workers are no better off as a result of changing the channel of exploitation merely, while the amount of exploitation is left unchanged. The real *motif* of Socialism is not merely to change the form of industrial organization and ownership, but to eliminate exploitation.

To sum up: the whole matter may be very briefly expressed in the form of a declaration of principles, as follows: Socialism is not hostile to private property, except where such property is used to exploit the labor of others than its owners. The socialization of property in the Socialist State would be confined to (1) such things as in their nature could not be held by private owners without subjecting the community to exploitation or humiliation; (2) such things as the citizens might agree to own in common to attain superior efficiency in their management.

VI

Granted the foregoing conclusions, it is evident that the fear of a huge bureaucratic Government as an inevitable condition of Socialism loses its force. Such a bureaucracy might be created, it is true; but it would not result inevitably from the amount of administrative work involved in the management of all property and "all the means of production, distribution and exchange." In fact, there is no good reason for disbelieving the claim made by modern Socialists that the amount of Government control over the individual would be far less than we are now accustomed to.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In this connection it must be remembered that the regulation of capitalistic property in modern society, especially in the great social services—such as the railroads, lighting companies and the like—involves an enormous amount of government which, under such a condition as that suggested as belonging to Socialism, would be wholly superfluous. When one thinks of the tremendous amount of legislative and administrative effort which experience, not theorizing, has shown to be requisite for the restraint of capitalist enterprise, the mind is staggered by the stupendous total. No one knows, for it has never been computed, how much it has cost the United States during the last ten years to "regulate" the railroads in their relations to the public. This much we do know—that it has been found necessary to enact an immense body of legislation for the regulation of capitalistic enterprise. To enact this legislation has cost an enormous sum of money: to enforce it has cost a great deal more in the way of maintaining an army of inspectors, judges and officials of one sort and another.

It has been said in criticism of the methods of conducting our public services that the amount actually spent in doing the work is in many cases only a fraction of the total cost. To illustrate: the actual operation of a street railway, including the men who make the cars and lay the tracks, the men in the power-house, motormen and conductors, is said to represent less labor than what may be called the bookkeeping of the railway—the army of "spotters," inspectors, collectors, cashiers, clerks, bookkeepers, accountants and the like. Most of these workers are in reality parasites; their labor is only rendered necessary by the preying of private interests upon the body social.

Similarly, it may be said that much of our Government is in a like manner parasitic, rendered necessary only by the preying of private interests upon the body social. The socialization of all the natural monopolies and the restoration of economic independence to the great mass of the people would render obsolete an astonishingly large body of laws, many of them irritating and humiliating to a degree that is oppressive, and would turn a large army of workers from parasitic to genuinely useful occupations.

Every abuse of capitalism calls forth a fresh instalment of legislation restrictive of personal liberty, with an army of prying officials. Legislators keep busy making laws, judges keep busy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interpreting and enforcing them, and a swarm of petty officials are kept busy attending to this intricate machine of popular government. In sober truth, it must be said that capitalism has created, and could not exist without, the very bureaucracy it charges Socialism with attempting to foist upon the nation.

There is, then, nothing in Socialism itself to warrant the assumption that it would enthrall the individual to the yoke of a bureaucratic government. There is no reason for regarding as impossible and absurd the assumption that, under a Socialist régime, the bounds of personal liberty would be greatly extended and the scope of government greatly narrowed. Whatever views one may entertain concerning Socialism, either as an ideal or as a movement, it is necessary and just to weigh seriously the claim, made in the national platform of the Socialist party for the year 1904, that it is "the only political movement standing for the programme and principles by which the liberty of the individual may become a fact." And, further, that "it comes to rescue the people from the fast-increasing and successful assault of capitalism upon the liberty of the individual." That claim cannot be waved aside by mere rhetoric, nor silenced by abuse. The fact remains that Socialism menaces neither private property nor personal liberty. There is nothing inconsistent with Socialism in the idea that Government interference with the individual should be as little as possible.

It will be said, doubtless, that the principles and the programme here sketched are those of Individualism rather than of Socialism as commonly understood. Granted that they satisfy the man who calls himself an Individualist, they are not therefore anti-Socialist. Socialism is not the antithesis of Individualism—except Individualism of the "Devil-take-the-hindmost," *laissez faire,* school. To that crude form of individualism, so-called, which accepts the doctrine that "Might is Right," under which the assertion of one man's might destroys the individual liberty of others, Socialists are opposed, just as the enlightened Individualist must be opposed. To the Individualism that is based upon equality of opportunity, the absence of privilege and the destruction of all artificial inequalities, so that Nature's inequalities alone manifest themselves, Socialism is not opposed. Indeed, Socialism comes as the fulfilment of that ideal.

Ninety-nine out of every hundred persons discussing this sub-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ject not only regard Socialism as the antithesis of Individualism, without any qualification whatsoever, but they make the far more serious blunder of regarding the present social system—if, indeed, one may use the word "system" to connote our industrial anarchy!—as a system of Individualism. Nothing could be more fallacious than this. The Individualism of the Fathers of the Republic, particularly of Jefferson and Samuel Adams, bears no relation to our present system with its ramifications of privilege. Free competition between man and man belongs to the concept of Individualism, but not so the competition, so-called, which takes place between the corporation and the individual. To make an artificial person, for legal purposes, of a great corporation such as the Standard Oil Company, and then to regard a struggle between it and an individual refiner or dealer as "free competition," is to do violence to language and reason.

Illustrative of the confusion of thought upon this subject which pervades all ranks of society, we have the declaration of the Ohio Republican Convention, in asserting the claims of Mr. Taft to be the successor of President Roosevelt, that the issue in American politics in the year 1908 is "Individualism against Socialism"—the Republican party and Mr. Taft representing Individualism! Could anything be more grotesque than the application of the word Individualism to the Rooseveltian policies? Could the word be more abused than by its application to the Republican party programme? If Socialism represents one side of the issue fought out in our national politics last year, the other side is not Individualism, but Capitalism with its privileges, its invasions of personal liberty, its artificial inequalities and its economic servitude of class to class.

The Socialist ideal may be vain and chimerical, but no thinking person can deny that the influence of the ideal upon masses of our citizens is a wholesome one. The political Socialist movement may spend itself blazing trails for others to follow, opening a way to a promised land it may not enter; but the world will be the better for its existence. Fanaticism, in the name of Socialism, and under its banners, may seek to do away with private property and personal liberty; but that will be a caricature of the Socialism for which so many millions of earnest men and women in all lands are living lives of consecrated sacrifice.

JOHN SPARGO.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CUBA'S FUTURE.

BY H. A. AUSTIN, FORMERLY CHIEF CLERK IN THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF IN THE ARMY OF CUBAN PACIFICATION.

THE aid of the United States in the internal affairs of Cuba has again been requested by the President of that Republic, and in compliance with that request the Administration at Washington has decided to detail three United States Army officers for duty in Cuba to undertake the work of creating an effective, well-drilled and well-disciplined Cuban army. The wisdom of this action is conceded by all, especially by those who are familiar with the sentiment prevailing amongst the Cubans, and it is believed to be but one move in a game played under the surface by a certain class of residents in Cuba.

When the United States troops were sent to Cuba in October, 1906, it was with the avowed purpose of restoring and maintaining peace until the country should be in proper condition to hold an election and secure a President and other officials to administer the affairs of state. At that time the Cubans generally accepted the declared intentions of this country as sincere. But the prospect of a lasting and peaceful republican form of government for the island was not seriously considered by many of the better classes of citizens—that is, the merchants, professional men, planters, and others. These classes were frank in stating their belief that the island would never be able to maintain a republican form of government, for any considerable length of time, without the assistance and guidance of the United States or of some other strong country.

On the other hand, those who professed to believe that Cuba could eventually take care of itself without outside interference advanced the argument, in referring to the failure of the Palma government, that it is unreasonable to expect the island to be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

come a strong and united nation within so few years after its birth as a republic. They argued that all the great nations of the earth have been founded on revolution and bloodshed. They cited the fact that England became the strong nation that she is to-day only after brother had fought against brother, neighbor had burned the home of neighbor, and war and devastation had reduced the nation to ruins. They pointed to the United States as another example of a nation which, for years after its birth as a republic, was turbulent with political dissensions and threats of disintegration, and they called attention to the fact that, even after nearly a century of peace and prosperity, the nation was almost rent asunder by one of the most sanguinary struggles the world has ever witnessed.

Notwithstanding the force of these arguments, the conviction prevailed amongst the higher class of foreign residents in Cuba, as well as among many prominent natives of the island, that a stable republic could never be established; and it was repeatedly predicted by these people, and by some of the representative papers of Cuba, that as soon as the American forces were withdrawn there would be a recurrence of the events which caused the United States to send an army of pacification there in 1906; that it would be only a matter of time when the American troops would have to return to restore peace and protect foreign property.

These were the predictions made in 1906; at this time their verification seems imminent, for within a week after the withdrawal of the American army from Cuba an insurrection was started on the island, which, however, for the time being at least, was successfully suppressed.

The Cubans, like some other Latin-American peoples, appear to be imbued with an insatiable desire for revolution; and, while the present President of the Republic seems inclined to rule with an iron hand, it will not be forgotten that, with all the methods of oppression and suppression resorted to by the Government of Spain for many years, that nation was unable to quell the spirit of revolution on the island.

These revolutions will undoubtedly continue to recur, under a republic, so long as the present conditions exist, for the simple reason that it is impossible to create a sufficient number of political offices to satisfy the ambitions of all the political leaders or so-called "generals." The make-up of the Cuban is different

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from that of the American citizen. In this country, if a man is removed from office under a change of administration or for other political reasons, he usually takes it as a matter of course, or, if he is defeated at the polls, he either smothers his feelings or lays plans for a future battle of the ballots. With the Cuban it is different. If he is removed from office or loses a victory at the polls, he immediately begins to "agitate"—not by that sort of peaceful agitation which is intended to instruct the people in the principles of the political party or faction to which he belongs, but by that agitation which smacks of personal revenge, which appeals particularly to the lawless element, and brings together in a protesting body the class of citizens who are ever ready to take up arms against the existing government, or to use alleged political grievances as a pretext for committing robberies and other depredations.

That the Liberal party, which fomented the revolution under the Palma government in 1906, had some cause for grievance is undoubtedly true. It is an acknowledged fact that the party then in power resorted to fraudulent methods at the elections in order to retain control of the government. The leaders of that party professed to believe that they were justified in this action, basing their belief upon the theory that their party represented the highest and most educated class of citizens in the Republic, those who were really interested in the welfare and upbuilding of the country, and that, having successfully conducted the affairs of state up to that time, they were justified in so manipulating the elections as to secure a victory for themselves. On the other hand, it may be said that the opposing party contained amongst its leaders many lawless and undesirable citizens, and that, had they succeeded to the administration of the government, they would have made as complete a failure as did the party against which their armed opposition was directed.

When the American forces arrived in Cuba in October, 1906, the country was in a chaotic condition. While the "*insurrectos*" and "volunteers" had presumably turned in all their arms to the American commission created for that purpose, the planters and property-owners generally throughout the island were in constant fear of the sword and the torch of the brigand. A system of blackmail had sprung up in the island which was exceedingly harassing. Armed bands, camped in the mountains, would ap-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proach the owners and managers of large sugar and tobacco estates, and demand the "loan" of a certain sum of money (which they never expected to return), threatening to apply the torch to the fields if such sum was not forthcoming. It is understood that some of the companies owning large sugar plantations set aside a certain amount each year for the satisfaction of these blackmailers, believing it more economic to lose this sum outright than to lose hundreds of thousands of dollars by having their crops destroyed by fire.

During the first days of the late American occupation, daily reports were received of threatened depredations, and a great many requests were made by sugar-planters that small detachments of American soldiers should be sent to their estates for the protection of their property. This the Commanding General of the American army very wisely refused to do. Under his policy the troops were distributed throughout the provinces in larger bodies, and from each station detachments were sent out on "practice marches," covering the country in its vicinity. This had the effect of not only hardening the troops and familiarizing them with the character of the surrounding country, but it had a reassuring influence upon the peaceful citizens and an intimidating influence upon the lawless and evil-doers.

Under this system the conditions on the island became as peaceful as could be desired. The planters were given an opportunity to harvest their crops without menace, financial conditions became improved and everywhere the people assumed their normal vocations and peace reigned supreme.

Realizing that these conditions resulted from the influence of the American army in Cuba, the better class of Cubans—except, possibly, the professional politicians and agitators—regret the withdrawal of American troops and the return to a republican form of government on the island. They would much prefer to see the guardian hand of the United States extended over the island for all time. And ultimately this will be undoubtedly done in one form or another.

If the present Republic falls, and the United States is again compelled to interfere in the affairs of the island, it is safe to say that something more than re-pacification will result. In this connection, two courses are open to us: the annexation of the island or the establishment of a protectorate over it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As far as the Cubans, generally, are concerned—the rank and file, so to speak—there are few who advocate annexation. There are several reasons for this. In the first place, the Cubans, having for centuries fought for their liberty, and having finally succeeded in obtaining it, would no doubt seriously object to losing their national entity in this way, although they are willing to accept the protecting influence and guiding hand of the United States, provided they can have some voice in the government. It may also be stated that the political leaders realize that, should the United States annex the island, practically all the high-salaried positions would be held by Americans, and this would be very distasteful to the office-seekers, who constitute a large percentage of the population.

While the native sugar-planter has had a period of prosperity since 1903, he has not received much direct benefit from the lowering of the tariff duty; and even if the tariff should be abolished under a scheme of annexation, it would inure to the benefit of sugar interests in the United States rather than to the native Cuban planter. What the latter desires more than anything else is the assurance that peace will be maintained on the island; he will in that event look after the financial end of the business. It is needless to say, also, that the question of annexation would mean a prolonged fight in Congress, as did the reduction of the Cuban tariff in 1903.

The last solution of the question—that is, the establishment of a protectorate—seems to be the most logical and probably the easiest to consummate.

In the administration of their government, there are three conditions which the Cubans desire to prevail: First, security from foreign invasion or interference; second, a force adequate to suppress interior disturbances; and, third, opportunity to hold a reasonable share of the public offices under an independent government. They believe that these ends can be accomplished with least difficulty through an American protectorate, and this scheme would undoubtedly meet the hearty approval of the Cubans at large. In Cuba it is discussed more than any other proposition, for it would not injure the pride of the people, it would allow them to hold office under the government, it would assure peaceful conditions on the island and prevent encroachment or invasion by any other foreign nation. By this means, also, the tariff

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

question could be allowed to remain *in statu quo,* and thus any opposition could be allayed that would otherwise arise from the sugar, tobacco, fruit and other interests in this country.

This scheme could be carried out in two ways, either of which would entail but slight cost to this Government or to the Cuban government.

During the late occupation the United States maintained between five and six thousand troops on the island, and that number proved to be entirely sufficient to assure peace and protect public and private property. Should this Government establish a protectorate over the island, a force of approximately the same size could be stationed on the island, the Cuban government being required to pay the increased expense incident to the service of our troops in that country, so that the United States would be at no loss in this respect.

It is believed, however, that the better method to pursue would be to utilize the present Armed Forces of Cuba, which consist of the Rural Guards and the Artillery Corps, numbering about 4,500 officers and men. This force, while having a military organization, is lacking in training and discipline. With these faults corrected, the armed forces of the island would undoubtedly be able to meet the requirements of the case. The reorganization and training of these forces would be a matter of time, and it can be accomplished without much difficulty by the three United States army officers who have recently been detailed for this purpose; the officers to take charge of the military establishment until such time as experience showed that the Cuban army could permanently maintain peace at home. Owing to the close proximity of the United States to the island, and the recognized policy set forth in the Monroe Doctrine, the subject of foreign invasion need not be considered at this time.

The scheme of instruction by American officers, suggested above, has been successfully tried before. When the Artillery Corps of the Cuban Armed Forces was organized in the winter of 1901-02 an American artillery officer was detailed as instructor, and through his efforts that branch of the military service has been brought up to quite a high state of efficiency. This policy would probably entail a smaller expenditure of money by the Cuban government than would the policy of keeping our troops on the island for any length of time, and in case it should be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

found expedient at any future time to again turn over the government to the Cubans *in toto,* it would be an easy matter to recall our officers to this country to resume their normal duties.

Should the present force of 4,500 troops be found insufficient to carry out the purposes set forth above, there is a law now on the statute-books of Cuba authorizing an increase of the Armed Forces to about 12,000, and under this law additional troops could be recruited until the number was obtained which would assure success.

In addition to the detail of American army officers to instruct and train the military forces of the island, it would probably be wise to appoint a sufficient number of experienced men from this country to act as advisers to the various civil departments. During the late occupation army officers were so detailed with wonderful success. Or the policy of Great Britain in Egypt might be followed, by granting authority to the American Minister to act as an adviser to the head of the government of Cuba, and to the American Consul-General to oversee all matters relating to the finances of the country. While England has never declared any definite policy in regard to Egypt under British suzerainty, that country has become a progressive and prosperous nation where corruption and decay once existed; and what has been accomplished by England in Egypt can certainly be accomplished by the United States in Cuba.

Under such a policy the future of Cuba need never be in doubt. With a stable government and peaceful conditions existing on the island, with its fertile soil and other natural physical advantages, Cuba, in reality as well as in name, would become the "Pearl of the Antilles."

H. A. Austin.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AMERICAN BOY AND THE AMERICAN MECHANIC.

BY REAR-ADMIRAL GEORGE W. MELVILLE, U.S.N. (RETIRED).

AMERICANS are frequently taken to task by people of other nationalities for boasting about their country; and indeed, with a country possessed of the greatest natural advantages, a mixed breed of men, originally of the best and the bravest, and the best form of government which has thus far been devised, it would seem that our pride is not without justification. In recent years, however, a note of warning has been raised by careful observers on the material side of things, and these warnings finally culminated in the Congress of Governors held at the White House under the auspices of ex-President Roosevelt. At this Congress the necessity for economy in the use of our natural resources was most strongly emphasized, and it was pointed out very clearly that we could not hope to maintain our pre-eminent position in the world if we continued to deal with the material gifts of nature in such a spendthrift fashion as has been our custom up to the present time.

Every sincere patriot will commend most heartily this attention to our material welfare; but it seems to me that there is a personal element which is of even greater importance, the neglect of which will bring about our national decadence just as surely as the waste of natural resources.

As I read history, the nations which have neglected the nurture of the skilled artisan have finally met with disaster or fallen into decay; this, of course, presupposes that the development of the mechanical arts is not coincident with a loss of manly courage, as was the case when the Turks destroyed the Roman Empire in the east and the Goths destroyed it in the west. In recent times, certainly, we have had a marked illustration of the correctness

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of this statement in our own Civil War, the mechanical arts having been almost entirely neglected by the South; and, more recently, in the war with Spain, where a vital factor in the collapse of the Spanish Navy was their incompetence as mechanics.

I am proud of the fact that I have been a mechanic all my life. I started as an apprentice; and, after completing the course, took up the mechanical side of the military profession as an engineer in the Navy. This means that I have been in close touch with the mechanic and his work for fifty years and have studied the question from all sides. In my younger days the skill of the American mechanic was the subject of frequent praise, which was thoroughly merited. I do not believe there ever was a more skilful lot of mechanics than those who were born in this country and passed through the usual apprenticeship fifty years ago or more. They were ready to turn their hands to anything, and the great mass of inventions which are proving so useful to-day is the fruit of their work. In recent years, however, I have noticed with great regret that our machine-shops and manufacturing establishments are coming to depend more and more on mechanics of foreign birth, who received their training before coming to this country. While immigration has been very large, the skilled mechanics have certainly not formed the bulk of it, and the reason for the reduction in the percentage of native-born American mechanics must be sought elsewhere. One very important cause is the limitation of the number of apprentices which has been brought about by the action of the Trades Unions. Many other observers have called attention to this condition, and have pointed out the folly of American workmen in deliberately preventing their boys from qualifying themselves for a good position in life by becoming expert craftsmen. The immigration of skilled foreign workmen is not limited in any way (and I would not for a moment advocate any such limitation); but the Trades Union leaders, with that fatuity which seems to have always accompanied such organizations, have tried to keep the number of skilled workmen at a minimum by restricting the training of American boys as apprentices. The foreign workman joins the Union and becomes a very active member of it, in many cases being the very one to prevent the American boy from exercising that liberty of which we are all so fond of talking. In the early days of the Republic, the business man used to boast that he had learned a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trade to fall back on in case of failure in his business pursuit. Many of our greatest men learned trades in their youth.

That the apprenticeship question is one of tremendous importance is shown by the substitutes which have been attempted by patriotic and benevolent citizens, who realize the necessity of skilled workmen of native birth, and who, to avoid the constant fight with the Unions, have attempted to get the final result in another way by establishing various forms of Trade Schools. I have no doubt that, so far as instruction is concerned, from the scientific standpoint, the Trade Schools do more for the boy than the old form of apprenticeship where there was no systematic curriculum and where the apprentice had to pick up what he learned. There is one great danger, however, in all schools where the primary aim is instruction rather than, as in a real factory, production. There is a strong tendency for the boys to forget that they are to be trained for handicraftsmen and to dream of becoming engineers or gaining some other position where they will not have to work with their hands.

Now, I would be the very last person in the world to discourage a boy's ambition; if he has it in him to rise to a higher position, well and good. At the same time, there is no doubt whatever that his thorough training as a skilled workman will give him a foundation for professional work which it is hard to over-estimate. As a matter of fact, a skilled workman to-day in the majority of trades can earn more money than the average clerk; and, if he has been properly trained, he will be proud of his work.

I am not altogether prepared to outline a complete scheme of apprenticeship; but I do believe that there should be no limitation as to the number of apprentices, and further that their training in the shop work should be in a shop or factory where work is done for a profit. I know that various methods are being tested somewhat along this line—notably a recent scheme in Cincinnati for the education of young engineers, where the theoretical work of the course is done in the college but the training in the use of tools is a part of the regular shop system.

Several of our largest manufacturing firms have very complete apprenticeship courses, but these are to give shop training to college graduates who are to occupy high positions in the office force. Some have also courses to teach boys the trade, and this is the particular work which I am now discussing. In some instances,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these courses are very carefully laid out and are under the special care of a superintendent chosen for his ability in this line. The fact, however, that these special cases stand out so prominently only serves to emphasize the point I am making, that the training of lads to become skilled mechanics is no longer a regular part of the work of every shop, but that it has become moribund, until the more progressive managers have waked up to the fact that they must provide for the future.

I do not want to be unfair to the Trades Unions, and undoubtedly they are not alone to blame. The growth of large factories, where automatic machinery enables an untrained man to acquire quickly the ability to be a machine-tender, and where there is so much work for each class of machine that even a highly skilled man passes all his life handling one kind of machine, has led managers who are thinking only of profits (and most of them are driven to this by non-technical Boards of Directors) to plan only for the present and to fill their shops with any workmen who can handle the machines. In the long run, however, such a course cannot succeed.

There is still another aspect of this subject which merits attention and which, as time goes on, may become serious. In a Republic like ours, where efficiency depends on the intelligence of the electorate, it has rightly been deemed of vital importance that the education of the children should receive most careful attention. "The little log schoolhouse" is most affectionately remembered, and many of our great men received most of their instruction in such humble places. With increased wealth, the public schools have extended their curriculum until the higher grades are giving what was a college course not many years ago. It goes without saying that a successful professional man stands higher socially and is better off financially than the skilled mechanic. Naturally, therefore, if it is made very easy for the boy to get such an education, the parents are tempted to sacrifice themselves to help him to get it, the result being that too many men with professional training are turned out for whom there is nothing to do. In the language of Scripture: "He cannot dig; to beg he is ashamed." In other words, many successful mechanics are lost in the unsuccessful professional men. The way to the professions should not be made too easy. Ambitious boys, who will make a success, will make personal sacrifices and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

do the hard work necessary. What we must guard against is making the securing of a higher education so easy as to encourage boys to take it who have not the qualifications to succeed.

This is not a novel thought, by any means. That eminent educator, Goldwin Smith, who was one of the famous faculty at the founding of Cornell University, after many years' experience as a teacher, and with the heartiest sympathy for making education as far-reaching as possible, announced some years ago that he had very reluctantly reached the conclusion that it was a mistake to make it too easy for all to have university training. A practical illustration of this very point was called to my attention some years ago by a very keen Scotch engineer who had spent a long time in Greece. In that small country it is very easy for almost any boy to go to the university, with the result that there is a superabundance of lawyers. As there is not enough regular business for them they drift into politics.

At the Conference of Governors, Mr. James J. Hill called attention to the inefficient way in which agriculture is prosecuted in our country; and it seems to me that something of the same sort is true about our manufacturing when we are neglecting this vital element of the proper training of young men to fill the places of the older ones. Our country is becoming more and more a manufacturing country, and, that being the case, the natural calling of a large proportion of our boys should be in the mechanical arts. If we permit a policy to obtain which will prevent the American boy from exercising his inherent liberty of choosing a trade and constantly depend largely for skilled mechanics on foreign immigration, a large part of our boys will be driven into the ranks of unskilled laborers; and if we foolishly encourage boys who ought to be mechanics to try to become professional men, we shall simply breed petty clerks and loafers.

No true American can possibly contemplate such a condition of affairs without serious apprehension, and I have written this brief article in the hope of attracting still greater attention to the subject, especially as the views expressed come from one whose active work is nearly over, who has no personal interest in the matter whatever, and who is actuated only by pride in the work to which his life has been given and by love of his native land.

GEORGE W. MELVILLE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STEVENSON'S PRAYER-BOOK.

BY RICHARD BURTON, PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH LITERATURE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA.

I DRAW from its handsome case of green crushed levant a little book, faded from its original proud purple to a nondescript brown, and entitled "Family Prayers," by the author of "The Faithful Promiser," "Morning and Night Watches," etc. The publisher's imprint is that of James Nesbit & Company, London, the year of publication 1853. A commonplace volume, surely, whether one looks to external garb or literary content. A prayer-book of over half a century ago, bound in sober cloth, undistinguished in paper, print or binding, is no such matter.

But stay, gentle reader. We are not come to the heart of this business yet. Human associations gather about this ordinary volume to give it spiritual significance. It is the most precious item in my library. For on a blank page is written, in a large flowing hand, the name of Thomas Stevenson; and turning to the fly-leaf (already with a quiver, mayhap, of expectation), one discovers a visiting-card affixed thereon which reads:

> Mr. Robert Louis Stevenson,
> Athenæum Club,
> Skerryvore, London.
> Bournemouth.

By this time those who are sealed of the tribe of Tusitala know full well why this homely book is to its owner of inestimable worth; and, forsooth, an object of interest to all bibliophiles the world over. Stevenson's father, as the signature shows, acquired

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the volume presumptively when his famous son was a mere lad—for he was but three when it was published. And in the fulness of years, when Louis was a young man already beginning to drift from the orthodoxy embodied in the Prayer-Book, it came into his possession and was apparently used much and made his own, as the pages with their pencilled marks in his own handwriting testify. Inserted between the leaves are sundry ferns, which upon expert botanical analysis reveal themselves as tropical beyond peradventure, and so point to the conclusion that Stevenson had the volume with him in the final years in Samoa; while the visiting-card suggests his possession of it in an earlier portion of his career. The volume also contains, to augment its interest and value, two sheets of mourning letter-paper, upon which are inscribed, in the elder Stevenson's large hand: "Passages of Scripture to be read in connection with each other"; the references which follow filling five pages, now yellowed by time. Furthermore, there is at least one insertion in the son's hand, while certain pencilled additions in yet another hand suggest the novelist's mother,—that devoted mother who so valiantly followed him to the far-lying Southern islands which were to be his "long home."

With this Prayer-Book before us, how easy to conjure up a picture of the family group in the Heriot Street house in the central part of gray old Edinburgh. That residence—"a substantial house of gray stone built with the solidity so customary in Scotland; looking across the Queen Street Gardens, where the lilacs bloomed in spring and the pipe of the blackbird might be heard, while from its back windows could be seen the hills of the Kingdom of Fife"—was the third occupied by the Stevensons during the life of Louis. Thither they removed when he was seven, and it is that mansion which, amply described by him and others, we associate with the writer, boy and man. In an upper story was his small suite of rooms, one of them originally his nursery; it was here he grew up, attended not only by his mother, but by Cummy, that wonder among nurses, whose memory is so fragrantly intertwined with those flowers of the imagination, "A Child's Garden of Verses." In this house, doubtless, God-fearing and regular as it was, the prayers in the little brown book must have been read aloud many a morning, delivered with all the picturesque unction we know Thomas Stevenson to have possessed, from more than one description left by the son. One longs to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

find in the mass of *memorabilia* which Robert Louis gave to the world some direct chronicle of this book, some hint of its use or token of its presence. But none such, I fear, can be found; at any rate, my search has been in vain. It must remain for the mind's eye to see the Heriot Street group listening from day to day to the words of worship drawn from the "Family Prayers."

The visiting-card, witnessing to the fact that in due time the little volume passed from father to son, is also an evocation; it recalls a three years' section of his life, momentous to himself and, in truth, to late nineteenth-century letters. It was the period of his mid-manhood, when, from thirty-four to thirty-seven years of age, he lived the life of an invalid at Bournemouth, in the house which his father, then fast aging towards death, had presented to Mrs. Stevenson, and upon which the name "Skerryvore," signifying the most beautiful of the lighthouses built of the family firm, had been appropriately bestowed. Stevenson, with that pathetic capacity of his for pleasure in the good things of fortune, had been vastly delighted over this gift and enjoyed to the utmost the family installation in their new demesne. It is described by Mr. Balfour as "a modern brick house, closely covered with ivy; from the top windows it was possible to catch a glimpse of the sea. There was one-half an acre of ground, very charmingly arranged, running down from the lawns at the back, past a bank of heather, into a chine or small ravine full of rhododendrons and at the bottom a tiny stream." As for the author's childlike delight in the house, take this very characteristic bit from the Letters: "Our drawing-room is now so beautiful that it's like eating to sit in it. No other room is so lovely in the world; there I sit like an old Irish beggar-man's cast-off bauchle in a palace throne-room. Incongruity never went so far; I blush for the figure I cut in such a bower."

From the view-point of literary creation, this fragment of his life was one of the most brilliant—perhaps the most brilliant—of his whole career. It was during these three years at Skerryvore that he gave forth the "Child's Garden," "Prince Otto," "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde" and "Kidnapped"—a quartette hardly to be matched by any other four books he produced. But, alas! his health steadily declined; seldom was he able to go up to London and make use of The Athenæum Club, of which, as his card indicates, he was a member, there to meet Colvin, per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

haps, or Lang or Henley, friends and cronies all. For the most part, he could not pass the confines of his own grounds. Hemorrhages were frequent and violent; an enemy "who was exciting at first, but has now, by the iteration of his strokes, become merely annoying and inexpressibly irksome," is his own comment.

Then, too, his father, who came down with his wife to live at Bournemouth in the autumn of 1886, in order to be near the son for the ensuing winter, rapidly failed and died in the next spring, his condition, mental as well as physical, being sad indeed. So that Stevenson's day darkened at this time in more ways than one. So poorly was he that, when summoned to Edinburgh by his father's passing, he went there, but was unable to attend the funeral because of a severe cold he had contracted. Yet the impression one gets of this period from the Letters, and from various other biographical testimony, is by no means one of gloom or discouragement; the incorrigible zest of life was always there: the keen interests, the gayety, the nobler interpretation of that "Sufficient-unto-the-day" creed which is so valuable for this workaday world. Dear friends of his—men like Henley and Fleeming Jenkins—were often at Skerryvore, and many were the revels and junketings of which it was the centre, despite the frailty of the Master. And to end with the brighter side, it was the books begun or completed at Bournemouth upon which his reputation most securely rests. The imagination kindles at the thought that, could we have sat with Stevenson in his much-admired drawing-room, or still better, beside his bed up-stairs during one of the enforced sojourns in "the land of counterpane," we might have picked up casually from the nearest table the little prayer-book now before us. Surely it had tales to tell of Skerryvore and its doings. Often it must have been in hand, one deems; as likely as not it was read from daily, in private devotion or family worship—we know such to have been the Samoan habit, and the proximity of the parents in that last Bournemouth winter makes it the more probable. But the brown book, however lovingly entreated, will not unlock its secrets. We must content us with inference and guess.

In view of his own unique series of fourteen prayers written for household use at Vailima, valued alike by the lovers of literature and the devotees of religious aspiration, Stevenson's ownership and use of this paternal volume takes on a special significance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One's curiosity is piqued by the question whether, in any traceable way, he was influenced by the family heirloom in the penning of his own petitions. Were there unconscious echoes of the cadences falling so early on his ear, in the more perfect prose rhythms of the prayers he wrote while he lived in the South Seas? It hardly seems whimsical to believe that there may be some connection between the two: for his cousin, Mrs. Napier, writes: "In the Vailima prayers I seem to hear again an old melody that I know well—the echo of his father's words and daily devotions." It would be going too far to assume that this refers only to the impromptu contributions to the home worship by Thomas Stevenson. It may well be that the prayers of this very volume were in mind. There are, at the end of the book of "Family Prayers," a dozen prayers for specific occasions, and it is but natural to read these side by side with Stevenson's own, in the hope that some parallel may be discovered suggesting direct influence. But no such result follows. Indeed, Stevenson's contribution to precatory literature is distinguished above all else by its unconventional handling, its complete dismissal of the orthodox terminology and mental attitude which characterize the "Family Prayers"; and also by its special adaptation to the setting of the habitat at Vailima—as illustrated, for example, by the two prayers entitled "In Time of Rain." No more striking illustration of the difference between the elder and younger generation in the matter of religious faith and religious consolation could be found than that afforded by these two sets of invocations. Reading those composed by Stevenson, one feels that for the man of our day there have come, verily, a new heaven and a new earth. And one also feels that in the spirit of worship, although the form be changed, the new is full as vital and deep as the old. It is the personal, the individualistic note you hear, as against the traditional and associative in the things of God.

But there are other features worth mentioning about the copy of "Family Prayers." Noticeable at a first reading is the excellence of its manner, the harmonious, even high beauty of the language in which it is couched. The prayers are independent in form of the unsurpassed English Book of Common Prayer; but for taste, fitness and literary felicity they are such as one would expect a household like the elder Stevenson's to accept with sympathy. One can easily believe that so fastidious an artist of word

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and phrase as the son would have been loath, even for purposes of religion and with whatever glamour of parental inheritance, to use a book, as he evidently used this one, which did not possess value of text as well as of tone. Albeit the orthodoxy of the volume is soundly old-fashioned, there is naught of the cheap and common to offend the taste.

One also notes the frequent work of the pencil, dividing off portions of a particular prayer as of special worth or application; and this expression of preference is interesting. A little examination shows that the impromptu editor, whether father or son, has invariably chosen what was most happy in manner or noblest in thought and feeling. Several times, for example, in an invocation for the welfare of the family, the allusion to the servants is stricken out. Thus: "Bless the members of this household. May they walk before Thee with a perfect heart. May the young be enabled to adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour in all things. May the servants be enabled to live out and act the lofty motto, 'We serve the Lord Christ.'" The final sentence is erased. Again, in another prayer, the text reads: "Bless us who are now surrounding Thy foot-stool, whether as master or servants"; and, as before, the final clause is pencilled through.

Does this mean that in the Edinburgh home the kitchen folk were not bidden into the fore-room worship; or that Stevenson down in the Samoan Islands, with his dusky servitors around him, did not wish to use the servile word? For it is not unlikely that this book was commonly read in the Vailima house before its master had indited his own prayers, or that they were merely supplementary to it. Whatever be the truth, there is a pleasant thought in the avoidance of the word suggestive of servitude.

Full of interest to the student of literature are the occasional comments and corrections that look to an improvement in the form of these printed prayers; just what we might have expected from Stevenson, whose ear was so sensitive to the subtleties of English speech. We should not wish the author of the "Christmas Sermon," "Prince Otto" and "Weir of Hermiston" to overlook, even in the mood of essential imploration, the distinction between "shall" and "will," "should" and "would"—a distinction, by the way, which the modern newspaper is rapidly obliterating from the public consciousness.

It has been said that the Scotch, as compared with the English,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are insensitive to this difference in speech forms; an idea which the student of historical English can easily rebuke and which the habit of the finest Scotch writers—Scott, Burns, Carlyle and Stevenson—shows to be unsound. Certainly Stevenson was as exquisitely responsive to such *nuances* of style as is the highly trained musician to close harmonies. In three places he has, plainly in his own hand, stricken out of the word "would" the initial letter and substituted the letters necessary to make it "should"; thereby changing a mood of volition to one of conditional futurity, where the latter was clearly the intention of the pious framer of the prayers. It is characteristic of Stevenson to take offence at this little jar, one of the imperfections of expression which, it may be feared, many to-day even of the writing craft could have let go by without a protest—and small wonder in view of the shoddy English dinned incessantly into our ears! It will do no harm to quote these passages that the illustrations in their altered form may be before the reader:

"Had it not been for this inconceivable stoop from the infinite, where *should* we have been this day?" A little reflection will show that conditional futurity, not modified willing, is what the Prayer-book means to convey, and therefore "should" is alone correct. And again: "Were we to be judged by the duties and doings, the sins and shortcomings, of any one day of the passing year, we *should* be righteously condemned." Here the intended expression of futurity is secured by the change. Once more in the sentence: "Where *should* we be at this hour, O *God*," etc., the pious author wished merely to imply futurity, not desire, hence Stevenson's substitution is perfectly sound. The interesting point in the three cases is, we may reiterate, the indication that even in what may be called the non-literary mood, the trained ear and the nice taste of the great essayist and story-maker could not abide false notes.

Several other changes or interpolations are likewise of interest. In one case the text reads: "We come anew on this the evening of Thy Holy Day," and there is an insertion after "We come" to make it read: "We come before Thee," the gain in correctness being obvious; here the instinct of the stylist is again at work.

A grossly careless passage which is set right is the following: "Let each feel that we have some work to perform"; the amended reading, of course, being: "Let each feel that he has," etc. And

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in another place, where the original runs: "May they repose their bleeding bosoms on Him"—which smacks of the crude anthropomorphic imagery of the older theology — the objectionable words, "their bleeding bosoms," are erased.

These are the only emendations, and the small number testifies in itself to the generally admirable style of this manual for family worship which was so long in the Stevensons' possession. The book had to run a double gauntlet, for Thomas Stevenson, too, was a man of most fasitidious literary taste.

How we would like to have revealed to us the complete history of the little brown book! What stories it might tell of father, son and mother, of gray Edinburgh, of the long wash of Pacific waves, of all the shine and color and alien charms of Vailima, if only its now yellow pages might murmur of the past. But it is something to possess it, to feel sure that it was handled, carried, often used by the man who has become to many of us something more than a distinguished writer, one of the chief ornaments of late Victorian literature; "that's the world's side." To the true-blue Stevensonian he is a friend and brother, listening to whose vibrant voice we are moved to deep love, and braced by whose sane and winsome doctrine of life we can face the struggle unflinchingly, and with a high heart.

RICHARD BURTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MODERNISM MEDIATING THE COMING CATHOLICISM.

BY PROFESSOR CHARLES A. BRIGGS, DD., D.LTT.

MODERNISM still continues to agitate the Roman Catholic Church, and will continue its work until it accomplishes its Providential mission. It is, indeed, in some respects the most important religious movement since the great Reformation of the sixteenth century; for it is not confined to the Roman Catholic Church, but is world-wide in its sweep, influencing more or less all Christian Churches, and in a measure all the great religions of the world. Modernism is, essentially, the spirit of the modern age, and especially the resultant of the many forces which have been working with extraordinary complexity and intricacy during the previous century, and which are rapidly approaching a climax that probably will produce one of the greatest revolutions and reformations of history.

The battle between Modernism and the Papacy is raging all over the Christian world. The despotic attempts of the Curia to crush it have been vain. Some of the most eminent Catholic scholars have been put under the ban, others have been excommunicated; numbers have been suspended from their priestly functions. Many more have been removed from important positions of usefulness to other less important positions where it was supposed they could do little harm. Great numbers have been simply silenced. What does this all amount to, however, but attempts to smother a flame which still burns fiercely? The attempts to scatter it only increase the number of conflagrations.

There are signs that a reaction has already begun. Some of the most distinguished prelates of Italy, France and Germany have rebuked the most offensive spies and detractors of their brethren, whom this sad controversy has brought to the front.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Even the Pope is said to have uttered words of caution. The public press of the world is boiling with indignation because of the arrogant dictation, and impertinent interference with their affairs, of Monsignore Benigni, the protégé of Cardinal Merry del Val, and his "*Corrispondenza Romana.*" There is profound dissatisfaction with the present situation of the Church all over the Christian world, and on the part of some of the most distinguished Cardinals and prelates. It is becoming more and more evident that the Pope has been systematically deceived.

The Pope, nominally the sovereign of the Church, is really now, as previous Popes have usually been, in the hands of a bureaucracy which in its own interests constantly misleads him in the most important matters. A simple-minded, devout man, with the best intentions for moral and religious reform, but without diplomatic experience and inexpert in the detection of intrigues, he remains shut up in the Vatican, carefully guarded from all improper associations, courted by adoring pilgrims and obsequious officials. He does not, and cannot, know any more of the outer world than is strained out to him through the screens of a multitude of flatterers and self-seekers. The few candid and straightforward men who are admitted to brief interviews are drowned, as it were, in the ocean of flatterers, and the frank words of the Pope to these are always denied or explained away in the official journals. As Sabatier says, "One need not be a modernist to be ashamed of this *Camorra* who have practically substituted themselves for the person of the Pontiff, and are clamorously forcing their will upon the Church."

Russia and Turkey, and even Persia and China, have been compelled by the modern spirit to constitutionalize their Governments and so destroy bureaucracy and despotism. It is really impossible for Rome to resist much longer this modern spirit. Rome cannot long remain the only absolute despotism on the face of the earth. What the Roman Curia is now battling for is its own despotic authority. The real secret of its outcry against Modernism is the dread lest Rome may be compelled to tread the footsteps of all modern States.

The Pope has undoubtedly made great reforms, several of which were reported as on the way in my article on "Reform in the Catholic Church" in this REVIEW: such as the reform of public worship in the interests of reverence and dignity; the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reform of the Curia and the reorganization of its congregations to increase their efficiency; the consolidation of seminaries for the priesthood, and the enlargement and improvement of their studies; the removal of the American Catholics from a missionary jurisdiction to the direct Papal jurisdiction; and the recodification of the Canon Law which is about to be published. Few Popes have accomplished so much in a little time. And yet all these reforms have been in the interest of the government and discipline of the Church and in the direction of absolutism and Mediæval conceptions of the Papacy. The Pope has not carried out his programme of restoring all things in Christ. He has been diverted to the bureaucratic interest of restoring all things to the Papacy.

This Mediævalism in government and discipline has inevitably carried with it Mediævalism in doctrines of faith and morals, and so the conflict with Modernism became inevitable.

I. Mediating Modernism. — The Modernists in the Roman Catholic Church are Modernists in that they use modern methods in theology. They do not differ from Mediævalists in the doctrines of the Church, but only in the form and mode of stating them and vindicating them. Mediævalists insist that the scholastic form of the doctrine must be maintained as well as the doctrine itself. This is precisely the same conflict that has been in progress all over the Protestant world between Protestant scholastics and progressive Protestants, between those who insist that the scholastic formulas of the seventeenth century should be binding, as well as the doctrines contained in them. The Protestant scholastics and the Roman Curia see eye to eye in this fight. Progressive Protestants and Catholic Modernists are lined up in the same ranks. It is no longer a battle between Protestants and Roman Catholics.

(1) Modernists use the method of Biblical Criticism and accept its results without hesitation. This method destroys a number of false views of the Bible; but it affects no official doctrines of the Bible of any Church, Roman, Greek or Protestant. Scholastics, Roman and Protestant, agree in the new dogma of the inerrancy of every statement of Scripture which Modernists, Protestant and Roman Catholic, deny.

(2) Modernists study Church History by the methods of Historical Criticism. This destroys a multitude of untenable posi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions. We have to do here, not with the Roman Catholic doctrine of the use of apostolic tradition alongside of the Bible as an authority in religion, but with traditional history entirely apart from apostolic foundations. Scholastics, Roman and Protestant alike, insist on traditional history. All Modernists insist upon the elimination of historic fact from the traditional theories in which it is too often shrouded.

(3) Modernists study dogmas by the use of Modern Philosophy. Modern Philosophy discredits the scholastic formulas in which both Roman and Protestant dogmas are encased; it does not discredit the dogmas themselves, but endeavors to set them in modern formulas that can be understood by modern men.

(4) Modernists accept without hesitation the results of Modern Science. They usually adopt the principle of evolution, with its valuable consequences. Scholastics, Protestant and Roman, tend to the opinion, baldly expressed by the late Dr. Begg, that all Theology was given to Adam and Eve in Eden, or at least as a sacred deposit to the founders of Christianity. All Modernists see in Church History a development, or evolution, of institution and doctrine.

(5) Modernists advocate a reform of the Church and its institutions in accordance with modern methods of government and discipline, and with scientific, social and economic principles. They practise the active rather than the passive virtues, and urge more comprehensiveness and efficiency in religious work. This involves practical reform all along the line. As the Encyclical says: There is nothing that the Modernists would leave untouched. The scholastics, Protestant and Roman, are hostile to reform.

It is evident that Christianity has, in this conflict between Mediævalists and Modernists, entirely new lines of cleavage. The old lines have become indistinct, the new lines are rapidly obliterating them. What is that, but to say that both Protestantism and Roman Catholicism are moving onward, impelled by irresistible forces, to a future which not even the Pope can determine? Are they drifting to destruction? Or are they guided by the Master pilot to a safe and sure haven? Modernism is the embodiment of the spirit of our age, that our Lord is using to mediate between the past and the future of His kingdom.

Modernists differ greatly among themselves, whether Roman

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Catholic or Protestant. There are radical Modernists who are impatient of the slow processes of scholarship and jump at conclusions. In their enthusiasm for the new, they become hostile to the old; and so they become revolutionary in their notions. Such Modernists discredit the movement. No one should blame the Pope for smiting them; no one should blame Protestant religious organizations for rejecting them.

Ecclesiastics have no fear of radicals, for they know that these are madly rushing to their own destruction; but they have an instinctive hatred of reform of any kind, and therefore conservative reformers are their terror, because they are conscious of the need of such reforms and know quite well that they can only postpone them. The Modernists, who have been smitten by the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches alike, are for the most part, not radicals, but conservatives, differing from their adversaries more in methods and structural principles than in substance and ideals—more as regards current traditional opinion, than with reference to the official doctrines and institutions of the bodies to which they belong.

The attack of the ecclesiastics upon conservative Modernists, in every case, has strengthened the hands of the radicals and stayed the hands of those scholars who were mediating the reconciliation of the Church with the modern world, and the advance of the Church to a higher and better future, by the use of the more efficient methods of modern thought and modern life.

The battle that is raging all over the world is between Mediævalism and Modernism. Even the Protestant reactionaries are Mediævalists in part, because it is the mediæval scholastic methods for which they battle. It is the same battle over again which Mediæval men had to fight against the exaggerated claims for Antiquity; which each generation in a measure has to fight against the preceding generation which would hold it in bondage. The Middle Age of the world had its work to do, and in doing it would not be trammelled by the methods of Antiquity. Mediævalism conquered in its day, and has dominated the Roman Catholic Church, and in a measure Protestantism ever since. So the Modern Age of the world has its task, and it will perform it without being bound by the methods of the Mediævalists; a task vastly higher and greater than that of any previous time in the world's history; a task in which the entire world is in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

volved, and the entire universe must be held in view, and the entire history of the earth and man and the universe comes into play. Thomas Aquinas, with all his wondrous ability, his scholarly grasp of material and his constructive genius, was in many respects a babe to modern scholarship, whose horizon of knowledge is vastly more extended; whose material is enormously greater, and whose constructive system must be immensely higher, deeper, broader and wonderfully complex.

The tasks set before the modern world are not merely those of human enterprise and invention, they have been appointed by the Sovereign of the whole earth. The problems set before the Church of Christ in our day are problems which Jesus Christ our King has given us to solve. The divine Spirit is in the Church of to-day just as truly as He was in the ancient and mediæval Church, and He is guiding us in all our movements towards the ideal, predetermined from all eternity in the divine plan and purpose. Uzzah once more thinks he can stay the ark of God from falling. Thomas once more doubts the presence of his Lord. The ark of God will protect itself in this modern age just as surely as in the Ancient and Middle Ages. Thomas will eventually have to acknowledge his Lord in modern, no less than in ancient and mediæval, History.

Modernism is not the antithesis of Mediævalism. It is its normal resultant. The Encyclical makes them antithetical. I shall not deny that there are some who call themselves Modernists who do the same; but these men are not true Modernists. True Modernists are mediating Modernists. Modernism mediates the transition of the Middle Age of the world into the Future Age, just as the Middle Age mediated the transition of the Ancient into the Modern. All history is one, because it is governed by the Master Mind that created and governs the universe. All history advances steadily and surely towards its goal, as the militant Church becomes more and more triumphant. The chief Captain of our Salvation assures the modern world of an eventual victory. We may battle and suffer and die in confidence that the goal will be surely reached. Neither the reactionaries nor the revolutionaries will prevail. The Church of God moves onward with stately and invincible step into our future as into every preceding future, with the Lord's prayer, "Thy Kingdom Come," in its heart.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

II. Coming Catholicism.—What is the Coming Catholicism? No one can tell in detail; but it is not difficult to determine in outline what the kingdom of God will eventually become, for we know in a measure at least the mind of our Lord, which is as certain of realization as the rising of the sun. We also know the great historic movements of the Church for nineteen centuries, and the forces which are now active in Christianity. These movements and forces, guided by the divine Spirit, will have resultants which we may discern with confidence.

(1) The Coming Catholicism will be a Church *at peace with itself*. Jesus said in his farewell discourse: "The Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in My name, He will teach you all things, and bring to remembrance all that I said unto you. Peace I leave unto you, My Peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth give I unto you. Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be fearful." (John: xiv, 26-27.) A Church, guided by the divine Spirit, sins against the Master when it is fearful or troubled, and not at peace with itself. The guilt of this sin is the fundamental trouble with the Christian Church to-day. The peace of the Church should flow on as a river under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Instead of this, the Church of Christ has been too often "like the troubled sea; for it cannot rest, and its waters cast up mire and dirt. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." (Isaiah: lvii, 20-21.)

Why should the Christian Church be so fearful of errors in theology, so troubled with schisms, so much at war with itself as to questions of government, discipline and worship? The Truth is mighty and it will prevail. Facts are invincible. The Holy Spirit is the inerrant guide given us by our Saviour. Let truth and fact do their battle against error and theorizing. Above all, have confidence in the presence, the power and the guidance of the divine Spirit. The great fault of the Church of our day is that, while it holds to the doctrine of the divine Spirit, it does not act as if the divine Spirit was really present and guiding as Jesus promised. The Coming Catholicism will be a Catholicism which is conscious of the divine Spirit in her midst, which will act under His impulse and guidance, and which will be without fear or trouble, at peace with herself.

(2) The Coming Catholicism will be a *reunited Church*. The Church of Christ has never in fact altogether lost its unity. As

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

St. Paul tells us: "There is one body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all and through all and in all." (Eph: iv, 4-6.) The Church of Christ is divided as a household, is divided with quarrelsome children; or as a nation is divided by warring factions. We have been so much occupied by our divisions that we have too often forgotten that we belong to the *one* household of God, the *one* kingdom of Christ. We have exaggerated the discord and depreciated the concord; we have misunderstood and misrepresented our brethren.

Several years ago, an eminent Waldensian in Rome said to me that there was not a single Roman Catholic scholar who understood the Waldensian position. I thought at the time that it would be difficult to find a Protestant scholar who understood altogether the Roman Catholic position. The Roman Catholics and the Protestants live in a different literary world, in a different religious atmosphere; and it is necessary for a Protestant to enter the Roman Catholic world, live in the Roman Catholic atmosphere, and so come into loving communion with his Roman Catholic brethren, in order to understand them. The Modernists, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, have in some measure this irenic spirit. They see that the consensus of the Church is vastly more important than the dissensus; that the consensus is the normal and legitimate inheritance of Christianity, but that the dissensus is, to a great extent, the crude, undigested and unwholesome encumbrance of Christianity which must either be cast off or revised or reformed. We may be certain that this dissensus will continue to decrease in importance.

As Harnack recently said: "Scholars in both Churches are engaged with marked independence in the solution of particular historical problems, and the value of their researches is recognized in both camps." A prominent Roman Catholic scholar, Monsignor Duchesne, the greatest living Church historian, recently published a Church History of the first three centuries, calmly discussing all disputed questions, such as the formation of the creeds, the Christological and Trinitarian controversies, the origin of the Episcopate and the Roman Primacy, and the history of the New Testament Canon; and, "with the exception of a few details," as Harnack says, nothing in this work can call forth the criticism of Protestant savants.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Harnack rightly urges upon conscientious men in both Churches the following admirable principles: (*a*) The confessional, or credal, differences of the two Churches, must be entirely removed from the political sphere. (*b*) Each party must try to be perfectly just to the other. (*c*) All useless controversies must be avoided and a fair and honest method of controversy instituted. (*d*) Each Church must earnestly try to appreciate and properly understand the religious and spiritual life of the other. (*e*) A higher unity, and the attainment of a truth which now lies beyond the grasp of both Churches, must be held up as the final ideal.

The faithful application of these principles in Christian brotherhood will eventually accomplish the Reunion of Christendom.

(3) The Coming Catholicism will be Catholic. The principles of Catholic Unity clearly manifest in the second Christian century are a normal and inevitable development of Apostolic Christianity. They have always been maintained by the Church, and will be even more dominant in the future than in the present. The great Catholic principles, as I have elsewhere shown, embrace these three things: (*a*) A consciousness of geographical unity in one Church spread throughout the world; (*b*) Historical unity by succession with the Apostles—this involves that nothing shall be regarded as Catholic that cannot be derived as a normal development of the Apostolic Church; (*c*) Vital or mystic unity with Christ—this involves that Christian life and worship, as instituted by the historic Christ, and maintained by union with the reigning Christ, shall be conserved as making the Church truly holy; in other words, the Catholic Church must be holy and apostolic, and so truly Catholic.

Now, all the great historic Churches of Protestantism, as well as the Roman, Greek and Oriental Churches, hold to these Catholic principles in theory; but in fact they all, without exception, sin against them in practices which are not in accord with these Catholic principles. They err by excess and by defect. The Church of the future will recede from these excesses, and overcome these defects, and so become more truly Catholic. In British Christianity, the Anglicans exaggerate apostolicity; the Puritans, sanctity; the Roman Catholics, geographical unity in the Holy See. What is excess in the one is defect in the others.

The three features of Catholic Unity are involved in the say-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing of Vincent of Lerins: "*Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est.*" This principle is universally recognized as valid; but in its application there is again excess on the one side and defect on the other. The Church all through its history has been impatient of results. It was determined to decide by Councils and Synods and Popes, rather than wait for the decision of the Holy Spirit. The fundamental Catholic principle is that the Holy Spirit will lead into all the truth; and that He will lead the universal Church into the possession of all the truth. The Church should always have waited until the divine Spirit had brought about the consensus, and not have forced the issue prematurely at the cost of discord, heresy and schism.

St. Augustine gave another phrase which has been of great significance here: "*Securus judicat orbis terrarum.*" It was this phrase, as quoted by Wiseman—"Therefore the entire world judges with security that they are not just who separate themselves from the entire world"—which made Newman a Roman Catholic. This principle is again correct, but the use made of it is often erroneous. It is quite true that the universal Church judges under the guidance of the divine Spirit, and in that judgment is at peace with itself, in unity with the divine Lord and the entire brotherhood; but it is not true that the individual Christian is bound to submit to the authority of the majority vote of a Christian Council, or of a Pope, unrecognized by the majority of Christians throughout the world.

The ecclesiastical authorities are always impatient for the decision, and are not content to wait until the divine Spirit has brought the world-wide Church to a knowledge of the truth and a conscientious acceptance of it. The ecclesiastics force the decision, and offend the consciences of a multitude of Christians as truly Christian as themselves. The Christian conscience rebels against a dogma that is forced upon it by external authority, without sufficient evidence to convince the intelligence. These ecclesiastics claim to themselves the possession of the divine Spirit, and deny it to brethren of equal rank, ability and piety with themselves. In such cases, the universal Church does not decide; and it certainly does not decide with security, in the possession of the Lord's peace and unity, but in strife and divisions entirely contrary to the principle of Catholic Unity. The time is coming when the true Catholic principle will reassert

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itself, when it will be truly and calmly applied. The concord, the consensus, of Christendom will be recognized universally as the judgment of the divine Spirit, and the dissensus as an evidence that the divine Spirit has not yet given His decision through the universal Church.

4. The Coming Catholicism will be *orthodox*. The divine Spirit, though grieved, never abandons the Christian Church. In the midst of all the strife and discord, the heresies and schisms, He still continues His gracious guidance. The decisions of the ancient Councils give the standard of Christian orthodoxy from which the Church will never depart. These decisions were premature and, as the history of the Church shows, in every case ineffective. The doctrines did not win acceptance because of these decisions, but in spite of them, by the slow process of reflection and discussion in the Christian world. The Nicene faith hung in the balance for several generations, and only gradually, in spite of conciliar action, won the consensus of the Christian world. This ought to have taught the Christian Church a wholesome lesson, but it did not. The way of ecclesiastical authority has ever been the way the Church has preferred, at the cost of numberless heresies and schisms. The venerable proverb, "More haste, less speed," has been illustrated nowhere else more truly than in the history of Christian Councils.

At the same time, the wrath of man was overruled by God to His praise, and the decisions of the Christian Councils did eventually gain the consensus of the Church and will never be overruled. It is true that modern men take exception to the formulas in which the doctrines are expressed, and it is characteristic of Modernists that they are striving to set these doctrines in modern forms and expressions which will make them no longer abstractions, but realities to the modern world. This is one of the phases of the battle that is now raging between Modernists and Mediævalists. The Mediævalists maintain that the form of the doctrine is as necessary as its substance; that we must accept the philosophical formula as well as the Christian material. But Modernists rightly claim that the modern age of the world has its rights, no less than the mediæval and the ancient, that it is impossible for moderns to think, feel and act in the traditional moulds of former ages which are unfamiliar to modern experience. The letter of these doctrines is dead, the living substance

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is wrapped in grave clothes. That these doctrines may live for us, these grave bands must be stripped off. Lazarus must come forth into the realities of the modern world. This is not to destroy the doctrines, it is rather to make them live again. It is not to bury them, but to raise them from the dead. It is not to substitute error and heresy for the doctrinal judgments of Christianity. It is to banish all error and heresy, due chiefly to misconceptions and misstatements of the theologians, by letting the pure, unadulterated, undefiled truth shine forth from the new candelabra upon which the ancient lamps of orthodoxy are now being placed.

(5) We might go down through the long highway of Christian History, and show that whatever has won the consensus of the Christian Church will always remain in the Christian Church, as a final judgment of the divine Spirit wrought out in the Christian experience of the universal Church; but I must haste to a conclusion. Which of the two great Christian bodies, Protestant or Roman Catholic, is to prevail in the future Catholicism? I do not hesitate to say: Neither. Both have their contributions to make to the Coming Catholicism. Whatever is genuine in Protestantism will pass over into the Coming Catholicism; whatever is not genuine will pass away. What is true and right in Roman Catholicism will abide; what is not altogether true and right will be thrown aside. Protestantism and Roman Catholicism will eventually rise above all the mists of prejudice, and the walls and citadels of ancient conflicts into the clear, bright heaven of eternal realities, and continue in a glorious brotherhood. Each, in its way, went through a crisis of reformation which has not yet reached its goal. Each, in its own way, is advancing towards a divinely appointed destination. Each has an important contribution to make to the Coming Catholicism, in which not only Protestant and Roman Catholic, but also Greek and Syrian, Armenian and Copt—yes, the Jew, the Mohammedan, and even India, China and Japan—will share; for in a world-wide religion, embracing all the races of mankind, every nation and every race will have something to say and something to do.

What, then, will be the great distinguishing principle of Coming Catholicism? It is the principle of sanctification by love. It must be evident to all that we have come into an ethical age, a sociological age; an age which resents mere dogma, and insists

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the realities of life; which cannot be satisfied with faith only, but demands good works; an age for holy men and women; an age whose impulse can be no other than holy, Christlike, self-sacrificing love.

This age is not worse than others. It is better. The Church has always from the beginning been growing better. Christ, the Head of the Church, "also loved the Church and gave Himself up for it, that He might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that He might present the Church to Himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." (Ephesians: v, 25-27.) We cannot doubt that our Lord has been, and is now, fulfilling His ideal. All History attests it, Christian experience manifests it, the ambition of multitudes of Christians throughout the world shows that, though the ideal has not yet been entirely accomplished, the advance towards it is more vigorous, more wide-spread, more determined and more effectual than ever before. Men are more and more convinced that nothing else but holy, Christlike love will solve the problems of the present age, and make the future what all men of good-will earnestly hope for. It alone will reconcile Christian to Christian, and bring about the peace and unity of the Church. It alone will give Christian thinkers and workers that liberty of conscience and opinion and practice which is indispensable to solve the hard problems inherited from the past, and those forced upon us by new conditions and circumstances in the present. It alone will reconcile Jew and Christian, for this is the ethical principle which binds Old Testament and New in indissoluble union: it is the everlasting *Shemah* of Jew and Christian alike. It alone will reconcile labor and capital, and solve the economic and industrial difficulties, with which the success of Christianity in our day is so inextricably involved. It alone will persuade the heathen world that Christianity is something more than the imposition of Western manners and customs, and an alien civilization, upon an unwilling Orient. It alone will knit together all nations and races in a Coming Catholicism which shall realize the highest ideals of Christianity.

CHARLES A. BRIGGS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PLEA OF THE CHILD LABORER.

BY AARON HARDY ULM.

THE person or persons who look for child-labor material in the South are pretty apt to find the kind they want. Conditions there present so many apparent contradictions that the outside investigator finds it practically impossible to obtain an impartial perspective. Such can only be secured at the best by long and patient toil, with a residence among these people in different sections and under varied influences. Even by this method, the investigators who begin with a purpose or anything bordering on preconceived opinions will find themselves handicapped; for there exists evidence which, if presented alone, will justify any view taken.

Much discussion of the subject leads me, in general, to endeavor to give a new point of view. The mistake made by all writers whose outpourings I have read is that they confine their investigations to the child alone, forgetting to study the kind of men and women turned out by an economic condition in which the employment of children of tender age is only the worst part and the basic principle.

In stating my premises, I must beg leave to make some personal explanations. In my fourteenth year, circumstances placed me in a cotton-mill as a fifty-cents-a-day laborer. I was taken from the country, where my home had been humble but comfortable, and my general environment of the average kind then to be found in the rural districts of the South. During the greater part of three years, I was a regular operative, working in different departments, and mostly in those where children are mainly employed. After that time, I was fortunate in obtaining employment on the outside, but for nearly ten years my life was cast among these people almost as closely as if I had been working

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

side by side with them. I was far from the land of cotton for two years; but, returning, I was a newspaper reporter for three years in the town where I had worked as a mill-hand. In that capacity the tragic and pathetic sides of the lives of mill-hands were presented to me more forcibly than they ever had been before, as my work took me to the courts regularly and kept me familiar with police happenings and the working of philanthropic and charitable institutions.

If I may be indulged a little further, I will state that I have made no special study of sociology, nor any study of social conditions excepting as I have thought and observed on all problems of life with which I have come into contact. I have been identified with no crusade against the evils I will hereinafter attempt to depict, and I have before written nothing on the subject except one or two newspaper "feature" stories.

I say unequivocally that it would have been better if the South had never come into possession of a single cotton-factory than to have founded a prosperous industry on the labor of children. This statement is radical, but true. It was the child that first attracted Northern investors there—in other words, cheap labor unencumbered by legal restrictions. Had the same regulations over the employment of children prevailed there as have obtained in Massachusetts for many years, this industry would not have grown so rapidly and would not now be of such great proportions. The average cotton-mill worker of the North is a product of generations, bred and born to the loom, or, at least, not new to industrial confinement. He is much better adapted to the service of a machine and to imprisonment within the four walls between which he must work than the Southerner of thirty years ago, who knew only the open, having come down from centuries of agricultural forebears ignorant of industrial restraint. The Northern operative is more profitable to-day, as is shown by the greater prosperity of the mills far from the cotton-fields.

This is one of the reasons why there has been no lack of children upon whom to nourish this industry. In the mad desire for that which furnished much of the cause for the Civil War, and which they risked their lives to resist—industrialism—the Southerners forgot the duty of race protection. Capitalists were invited to build mills and allowed to draw discontented thousands from impoverished farms, to clutch them with the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tenacity of a vise and practically to own them. Comparatively few who are once drawn into the attractive web of cotton-mill work have been able to escape this doom. Once habituated to it, the workers find a fascination in it that is hard to resist. In the old mill towns, and there are a few that have existed for a century or more, may be seen families that have little or no record or memory of any other life. So far as they know, all their ancestors were mill-workers, and they take it as an indisputable edict of fate that they must ever be mill-workers also. Accustomed to the military-like routine, to the easy care-free existence possible in the half-feudal communities, few ever desire to better their condition. This is particularly true of those who begin the work in childhood. To-day thousands of white people are bound to a single calling, living a life that knows not ambition and encourages no initiative. There can be only one result. Apart from the tendency of the work to cause physical deterioration, the system, if not checked, will produce a race of irresponsible dependents,—a class bound by the iron hand of caste and industrial necessity to a lowly place in life.

This state of affairs is largely due to child labor. I have seen children seven years of age working in the mills. I have known them to be compelled to spend twelve hours therein for the munificent sum of twelve and a half cents. I have known others to grow up from infancy therein; first accompanying their mothers to their work, and then becoming sweepers, few of them receiving more than twenty-five cents a day, at the first show of sufficient strength.

The statement recently made that the "lowest class of whites" go to the mills and place their children therein, therefore in reality bettering the condition of the little ones, is, unless modified, untrue. It is a fact that many workers are drawn from the lowest class, but this class is not composed of the "poor whites"; it is lower, being more commonly known as "white trash" or "tacky people." They do not make successful mill-hands. They seldom remain there very long, but return to the hand-to-mouth, work-free existence of rural life. The exceptions are in cases where there are a sufficient number of children in the family to provide a livelihood for all. Then the little tots are forced by idle fathers and indolent mothers into the factories and compelled to stay there. Follow these children, and you will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

find that, as soon as they reach the years of self-will, heredity asserts itself; the boys become tramps or cotton-mill hoboes, travelling from place to place and working only when it is necessary to keep body and soul together. This product of the system often marries a weak woman, and then compels her to work while he loafs with others of his kind and spends the money she earns. So numerous is this specimen of so-called "man" that he has given rise to a brand-new term—"dinner-toter"—which denotes the only useful thing he ever does, that is to carry the midday meal to his servile companion. The girls often become prostitutes—I refer only to the "lowest class of whites," for in the cardinal principles of chastity no girls are purer than those of the average "poor whites," either in mill or country.

The greater proportion of the mill-help comes from the one-horse farmer class, the people who have risen above the "white trash" element or fallen from the home-owning one. It is the class of people who have to rent land and lack the perseverance or good fortune to establish permanent homes, but who live in a fair degree of comfort and give their children the nucleus of an education—that is, as long as they remain on the farm. Often the children are allowed to chose between mill and field, and few white girls of self-respect fail to choose the former. The boy casts his vote for the factory, in order that he may have opportunity to realize romantic dreams of town or city life; the element of pride does not enter into his calculation, for in no part of that section with which I am familiar is it considered anything but honorable and commendable for boys or young men to wield the hoe or follow the plough.

During the hard times after the Civil War, thousands of these people flocked to the mill centres, then in the first stage of development. Later, during the depression of the early nineties, they went in such numbers that there was a congestion of labor in the cotton-mills and a labor famine on the farms.

In the mills are representatives of the best families, but these are rare. To do such work places a social blot upon one which few well-connected people will bear; I have known them to suffer the lack of food rather than sacrifice their pride in such endeavor.

It is true that many go to the mills from the mountains. One who investigates with the eye and ear alone will think, and reasonably so, that the change betters the state of the children.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Their homes in the hills are squalid; the mill homes are plain, but secure from rain and cold, and fairly sanitary. In their native region, schools are often unknown, culture a stranger and religion a weird superstition. In towns they have at least the semblance of schools, and churches that are looked after by young and unpractical "charity" preachers; and on Sundays they occasionally observe a well-dressed sightseer and hear respectable English spoken. In the mountains, they have hills and open fields, the fresh air and the uplift of all nature. Their social life there is governed by a crude code of ethics and morals; a standard of personal honor prevails that might well be copied in more "civilized" communities; they retain their physical and mental virility, and occasionally send forth a boy who becomes famous. This cannot be said of the mills to which, in some sections, they flock. The children are kept in the mills to support fathers who idle their time in saloons or with worthless companions. That which happens when any crude people—and that is what these mountaineers are—are thrown together in large bodies occurs here. They lose the good qualities of their former state, while all the bad qualities crop out with renewed force. However, outside the Piedmont region the mountaineer is barely known as mill operative.

Despite so-called "child-labor legislation," any girl or boy, ten or eleven years old, and of average physical development, can obtain employment in the majority of the mills of the South. In nearly every State, if not in all of them, the laws are nullified by the absence of practical methods of enforcement and by the many subterfuges and evasions possible. At least fifty per cent. of the work can be—I do not say is—done by children under fifteen years of age. The reason they do not do more is that the supply of children is less than the demand. In my experience, some of which occurred during a congestion of the labor-market, I never saw the time when a child could not obtain employment.

An artist is ridiculed for drawing the form of a little girl beside a loom. Any one fourteen years old and of average intelligence can operate four looms; in cases of special proficiency and industry I have known one of such age to operate six. Child weavers are not common, because, the work being paid for by the piece, there is no opportunity for discrimination against children. It is natural that an adult should take better care of the ma-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chinery and make it more productive. The spinning-room forces are almost entirely made up of children. The idea of an adjustable spinning-frame is laughed at by one who knows, for such a thing is not needed so long as boxes or stools will supply deficiency in height—which is a handicap even to the smallest of them only when reaching for and placing in position the spools of twisted cotton.

In midwinter, these little workers see the break of day as they trudge along the route to the mill or look from the windows of the room in which they work. During that season they work an hour morning and evening, on an average, by electric light. They hobble to their homes, often along badly kept streets, through almost total darkness. Considering the time they spend in dressing and breakfasting, the time spent going to and from work and at supper, these children have little more than ten hours of each twenty-four to themselves for unrestrained rest or study. And many young men of my acquaintance attended schools at night, and acquired, while boys, good common-school education under these severe restrictions. This proves the hardihood of the race, a large part of which the mill system is devouring.

In the mills the workers are thrown together promiscuously. All classes, characters and ages must work side by side. Little girls, who should not know the meaning of sin, must often toil in close companionship with brawny, rough men, whose language is not always clear of profanity or even indecency. These innocent little ones have before them daily the example of those of their older co-workers whose self-respect has broken down beneath the strain. Those angelic few — for whom monuments should be erected—who withstand it all and grow up amidst temptation undefiled, retaining pride and self-respect and refinement, are placed in the position of an unassertive minority, which is little attractive to an inexperienced child. Tiny boys go there from the innocence and the native culture to be found on even the poorest farm, to be thrown among a hardened class of youths whose ambition is solely to pattern themselves after the bad habits of their elders. To chew the most tobacco, to smoke the greatest number of cigarettes, to use most deftly the unprintable words of blasphemy and obscenity, are soon bound to be considered marks of superiority. Where is even the man who does not like to stand well before his fellows, and to be looked up to by his intimate companions?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The work, of necessity, affects physical and mental growth. The absence of sunshine and fresh air, the dust-charged and lint-laden atmosphere which they have to breathe, the humid climatic conditions, the long hours upon their feet and the stooped position they have to assume while performing their duties, particularly in the case of "doffer boys," can have no other effect than to prevent the normal development of the physical functions. Search the records of the War Department. Seldom is a young man who spent his life in a cotton-mill accepted for enlistment. Even during the Spanish-American War, when the usual restrictions were slackened, only a small percentage of such applicants were accepted. So hopeless have they become as prospective soldiers that the recruiting service now makes but little effort to secure them; such work is looked upon as futile, though applications are always plentiful. Physical examinations show them to be lacking in height, or too tall for their weight. Arms and legs are often abnormally long, and in a large majority of cases the chest measurement is alarmingly inadequate.

The ceaseless hum of machinery to which they are subjected gives a warped direction to their brain, and the starved physique appropriates practically all the natural nourishment, at the cost of the brain, that comes in their path. The absence of any educative element in their work, excepting that they use their hands, tends to destroy all inherent ambition and to smother energy. The long hours and small pay stifle perseverance.

I am speaking of the mill-workers who begin as children undeveloped, mentally and physically. Talk to one of this class of operatives who has reached maturity. His hopes will be found to centre around the next pay-day. For him two weeks is the future. Speak to him of obligations to his wife and children, and learn that he regards them—with crude affection, it is true—as representing a certain present or prospective income, much as you would regard a good horse you raised from a colt with mixed feelings of love and interest. Go into the mills and see them work in bare feet with their bodies half-clad, in order that they may wear badly fitting, but creased and starchy, store clothes on Sunday. Note the lack of modesty among the young women of this class—their makeshift working costumes, their snuff-rubbing and expectorating habits, and their childish love of gaudy apparel for use on holidays.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the mills, or most of them, the girls and women are provided with dressing-rooms that are neither sanitary nor comfortable. Often these are not more than partially private. A hundred or more have to use a small enclosure of less capacity than the average sleeping-apartment. They must provide their own soap and towels, and use for a basin a common iron sink, unless they keep one of their own. Little provision is made for sitting down during leisure moments.

Little girls are frequently subjected to and must hear the vulgar taunts of coarse overseers and foremen, and the older and more comely ones must often repel at the cost of fair treatment, or accept at the cost of their honor, the privileged advances of the "boss." Women who are shamelessly base are in some instances allowed to flaunt their immorality before the eyes of budding childhood, paying a little of the tribute of hypocrisy to virtue, and in such cases the young ones have every opportunity of observing how the roadway is smoothed for the woman who enjoys the special friendship of the superintendent or overseer.

What is the result? Few children who enter the mills below the age of fourteen ever do anything else or better. The boys of this class seldom rise above the ordinary operative. They marry early and unprepared, and the girls, nearly always too young to bear the burden of motherhood under the most favorable conditions, must assume that sacred trust, work in the factory and care for her home all at the same time. What kind of progeny can be expected from them? Separations or desertions often begin before they are together more than a few months, and life becomes a series of domestic squabbles. In other cases, children come rapidly, and are reared in the most squalid fashion, and are put on an earning basis as early as possible. These children are necessarily weaklings from infancy; they live a life of misery; and, as a rule, they die early, but not until they continue the chain of burden-bearing through reproduction.

This is the appeal of the child, and through it of the race.

It is no problem for the impracticable philanthropist, or the maudlin sentimentalist. As a recent writer well observed, it needs the application of common sense. Those who study it must explore the hearts of the poor folk and sound the depths of their melancholy souls before progress will be made. I have refrained from giving examples, as none, not even a collection, would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fairly represent the situation. Each could probably be duplicated in other fields. I could have cited—of the tragedies that have crossed my own life—happy homes that have been shattered and its members sent like chaff to the four corners of the earth. I might mention cases of imbecility and physical deformity that, of my own knowledge, have resulted from this system. Individual cases might be given of girls whose pride and self-respect have been blasted, and of boys whose prospects and hopes have been wrecked on the breakers of cotton-mill circumstances. Such illustrations would only represent extremes.

There are numerous companies, presidents and superintendents, whose humanity in dealing with these conditions is unsurpassed. Many have enforced age limits outside and above the law, and I know of my own personal knowledge that several companies endeavor in every way that is compatible with the demands of competition to make their operatives better men and women and to keep them so. Some of these companies sacrifice dividends in the interest of their help. There have been times when operatives of an entire community would have suffered severe distress had not their employer, the company, at great expense stood between them and misfortune. In most of the small mill towns, the companies exercise a paternalism that is benevolent indeed. The mill operative and owner are inherently as good people as the world produces. It is not the men, but the conditions, that must be decried.

There are boys of my acquaintance, whom I number among my best personal friends, who have risen above these conditions, to make their places in business and the professions, and girls who have become the best of wives and mothers. These instances argue nothing in defence of the system, but they speak volumes for the indomitable courage of the Anglo-Saxon.

To correct these evils, there must be some sort of harmonious action on the part of all the Cotton States. It is not fair for one to deprive its investors of privileges enjoyed by those of another. For general adoption, I recommend the following, and I take occasion to predict that these regulations, or some of similar character, will some day be enforced throughout the Southern mill section:

Forbid the employment of children under fourteen years of age, without exception; forbid the employment of children un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

der fifteen years, except during the vacation period; forbid the permanent employment of children under sixteen who cannot show a certificate of completion from a standard grammar-school.

As for exceptions to most of such statutes in favor of "widowed mothers and invalid fathers," by which, it may be said, the laws can be forever evaded, I beg to say that they are not needed. There is no such mother or father who cannot get along just as well with his or her children outside as within the mills.

In addition to the child regulations, I suggest the following:

Separate the sexes as far as practicable. (This can be almost completely done.)

Require the employment of women foremen or "second hands" for their own sex.

Make it a crime to employ a married woman who is a prospective or young mother.

Forbid the employment of women or children for night-work.

Compel the companies to furnish comfortable chairs or stools for the use of the girls and women during leisure moments, and adequate, private and comfortably equipped dressing-rooms.

Provide Factory Inspectors, some of whom shall be women, to devote their entire time to seeing that the laws governing child and female labor are enforced.

Provide severe fines or confinement in prison for presidents or superintendents who permit violations of the law.

It might be said that these regulations are practically in operation over the big department stores of the large cities, where the hours are shorter, the work lighter and lurking danger less imminent—also over factories in many States.

I will state in conclusion that close intimacy with mill conditions ceased with me six years ago. Since that time I have made some investigations, and, while there is much to be corrected, I must state that there has been considerable improvement. The trend of legislation in all the Southern States is favorable, and I have no doubt that in a few years all that laws can accomplish towards removing the evils of the system will have been done. But the greatest good will come through the awakening of the bulk of noble Southern people to the needs of, and conditions surrounding, their unfortunate brothers and sisters of the mills.

AARON HARDY ULM.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN RHODES SCHOLARS AT OXFORD.

BY GEORGE R. PARKIN, ORGANIZING REPRESENTATIVE OF THE RHODES SCHOLARSHIP TRUST.

THE scholarship system established by the remarkable testament of the late Cecil Rhodes has now been in operation for five years, and one of its results is that about ninety young men, drawn from every State in the American Union, are at present pursuing their studies at Oxford University under the provisions of the Trust, while two earlier groups, numbering eighty in all, have completed their three years' course of study there, and have returned to work out their careers in their own country. They are a part of a still larger body brought to this ancient home of learning under the same auspices. It includes representatives of all the great, and of many of the smaller, colonies of the British Empire, together with a lesser representation of the German Empire and so of that great Teutonic stock from which the Anglo-Saxon race has sprung. During the last academic term of 1908, the number of men thus brought into residence at Oxford numbered 189 in all. They form about a twentieth part of what is perhaps the most representative gathering of students to be found in the United Kingdom, chiefly composed of young Englishmen, if we hold that word to its strict meaning, but with a fair proportion of men of Scottish, Welsh or Irish descent. It may be safely assumed, therefore, that nowhere else in the world is there collected together, for purposes of common study and with opportunities for intimate personal intercourse, a body of students so typically characteristic of all the material which goes to make up what we call "the Anglo-Saxon race." This is a concrete realization of the thought which seems to have been uppermost in the mind of Rhodes when he made his will.

Starting with a profound belief in the high destiny and benefi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cent influence of the British Empire, and eagerly desirous to promote the permanent unity of its various parts, while increasing their strength and usefulness, his first intention, as a means to this end, was to bring the youthful vigor of the colonies into touch with the experience and culture of the Mother Land, in the belief that both would thereby be benefited. As time went on, his advancing thought led him to conceive that still higher ends would be served by the co-operation of the United States with his own country in carrying forward the work of civilization, and still further that the increasing influence of Germany made its support and sympathy for the same purpose of the utmost importance. He believed that great good would result to the world from a mutual understanding between these various peoples, and using the means which he had in his hand he took the step that seemed to him most likely to promote such an understanding. His plan was very simple. He would secure as the agents of his purpose picked young men of these nations. For these he believed that the strongest bond of sympathy would be created by a common education. He therefore arranged that, for all time to come, nearly two hundred scholars of these countries should be educated together at the most ancient and famous seat of English learning and training.

This great and original conception has struck the imagination of the world more than any other testamentary disposition of wealth made in modern times. The lofty spirit of patriotism which inspired it, the touch of wider idealism which gave it a distinction altogether singular, the striking part which the testator himself had played in the drama of British national life, all contributed to throw a glamour of strange interest over the plans by which Mr. Rhodes proposed to perpetuate and project on the future of the world the ideas which had absorbed his busy brain during his short lifetime. Even considered merely as a monument to the founder himself, it is unique in this, that it is a monument to be gradually built up of living men, inspired by the thought of service to their fellows, and specially equipped for doing this service. Whether the aims he had in view will be accomplished is a question that the centuries alone can answer. Nations take long to grow; the influences that move them operate slowly and sometimes almost imperceptibly. Still, one may doubt whether there is in the world to-day in operation any scheme more nobly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

planned for the realization of a large and generous object. The inspiration of a great idea gives dignity to any work and any worker, and he will be a poor Scholar who, after eating for three years the salt that Rhodes has provided for him, is not touched with some of the divine fire, the devotion to world service, which burned in the spirit of the Founder. And we may fairly hope that, once in a while, there will be found the exceptional man in whom will be kindled the white heat of that flame to help him to "lift the world's heart higher."

This much by way of introduction to a brief statement of the principles on which the Trust is administered, the conditions under which American Scholars participate in the scheme, the methods by which they are selected, and the opportunities opened to them.

In his will, Rhodes indicated clearly his general intention in establishing the Scholarships, but he was wise in leaving his Trustees a comparatively free hand in giving them effect. In doing this, they have availed themselves of the best advice within their reach in each of the communities to which the endowment extends. In the United States, this was done by a series of conferences held in various parts of the Union, at which the opinion of the leading educational authorities in all the States was consulted as to the methods that could best be followed in executing the Trust. When these, after much discussion, had been settled, a Committee of Selection, consisting for the most part of educational experts, was formed in each State, and to this Committee the final selection of the Scholars is entrusted. Only to a very limited extent do the Trustees interfere with this choice. To make sure that no elected Scholar will be rejected when he arrives at Oxford, they have arranged that a preliminary examination shall be held in each State under the direction of Oxford University itself, on the results of which certificates are issued that are accepted by the Colleges as a qualification for entrance. The Trustees, and I think Oxford, would have preferred that this qualification should have been fixed on some sufficient standard agreed upon among themselves by the American Colleges and Universities from which Scholars come, but the extraordinary variety and range of these institutions in the United States have so far rendered this course impossible. All candidates who obtain this Oxford certificate of qualification are free to present themselves

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the local Committee of Selection, which is directed to use its judgment in selecting the Scholars in accordance with the general principles laid down by Mr. Rhodes. The Committees are left absolutely free to apply to the candidates any further tests that may seem helpful towards securing a wise selection. Thus it is American judgment which ultimately determines who the American representatives at Oxford shall be.

From a national point of view, the responsibility placed on the Committees seems very considerable. Not only will English opinion of the scholarship, character and all-round qualities of American youth be largely formed for the future by the type of man sent as Rhodes Scholars to Oxford, but the benefit derived from the endowment by America itself will depend on the quality of the material selected.

In constituting the Committees, the one aim of the Trustees is to secure that the judgment they give shall be competent and, above all, impartial. So strongly is it felt that political, denominational, sectional or other bias should not affect the selection, that I am satisfied the Trustees would, without hesitation, suspend, as they have power to do, the award of Scholarships in any community where it was shown that an impartial verdict could not be obtained. The greatest assistance that public opinion in America can give towards the successful operation of the Trust is to insist that the selection of Scholars shall be made on merit alone.

The Committees as at present constituted are for the most part academic, though in some States it has been found useful to introduce judicial or other outside assistance as a balance between conflicting educational interests. The Trustees welcome any advice coming from a competent authority as to the way in which the Committees of Selection may be constituted in any given State so as most fully to command public confidence.

While care was thus taken to secure an impartial selection, arrangements had also to be made for the reception of this large body of students at Oxford. Admission to an American University usually depends on passing a definite matriculation examination, and any one who has done this may expect to be accepted without further question. Each one of the twenty-one Colleges of Oxford, on the other hand, holds itself quite free to accept or refuse any candidate, whether he has or has not passed such an examination; and, more than this, the University does not ac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cept a man for matriculation unless he has found a College which takes the responsibility of presenting him. The difference springs from difference of condition. The Fellows of an Oxford College know, when accepting a student, that they will not merely have to teach him, but that he will for some years live with them under the same roof, dine in the same Hall, and generally be brought into an intimate personal relation seldom known in an American University. Naturally, under such circumstances, in selecting from a number of applicants, a College which thus forms a domestic community within itself looks in some measure to what will make that community an agreeable and desirable place of residence, as well as what will give it intellectual distinction. It was, therefore, a very distinct innovation on precedent which had to be made when it became necessary to get assurance beforehand that a large body of students drawn from the ends of the earth, and of whom nothing was known personally, would be received into the various Colleges. It was impossible, of course, to vouch by anticipation for the intellectual calibre of the men who were to come. But I did feel free to say that, knowing the communities from which they were to come, those who would select the Scholars, and the conditions of election, the authorities could at least depend with a good deal of certainty on receiving men of serious purpose and proved character. On these grounds each of the Colleges agreed to depart from its usual rules and receive a proportion of the Scholars sent to them by the Trust, and on its recommendation. There remained the business of determining the College to which each man should belong. It was felt that the true policy would be to distribute the men throughout the whole University. This is accomplished by a method which gives a limited freedom of choice both to the College and to the Scholar. Each Scholar on election is asked to give a list in the order of his preference of the Colleges which he would like to enter. For example, twenty men may name either Balliol, Christ Church, Magdalen, New College, Trinity or any other College, as their first choice, with half a dozen others to follow. The names of the whole twenty candidates are sent to the College thus placed first, along with the credentials and documents on which they have been elected, which give full information about their previous educational course, and opinions by those who have trained them on the personal qualities to which Rhodes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attached importance. From this list of twenty, the College selects the four or five or six which it has agreed to take, basing its decisions no doubt on what it thinks fulfils its ideals or what will bring distinction to itself. The remaining names are then sent on to the second choice of the candidates, and so on till all are located in some College. The excellence of a Scholar's previous record counts largely in securing him admission to Colleges whose reputation enables them to pick and choose from among great numbers of applicants. It may be added that College authorities soon learn to distinguish between exaggerated commendations and such as are justified by subsequent performance.

The question of the age and the stage of education at which the Scholars should go to Oxford was one to which much thought was given and about which the Trustees were most anxious to consult local opinion. When the Scholarship scheme was first announced many fears found expression in the American press lest the Scholars should be too much Anglicized by their life at Oxford, and thus unfitted for efficient American citizenship on their return. In his will, Rhodes expressed definitely and strongly his views on this point. "I desire," he says, "to encourage and foster an appreciation of the advantages which I implicitly believe will result from the union of the English-speaking people throughout the world, and to encourage in the students from the United States of North America who will benefit from the American Scholarships to be established, for the reason above given, at the University of Oxford under this my will an attachment to the country from which they have sprung, but without, I hope, withdrawing them or their sympathies from the land of their adoption or birth." This wish of the Testator the Trustees have kept steadily in view. It influenced greatly one of the most important decisions they were called upon to make, by which two years of previous work at an American University is made one of the conditions of eligibility for election. It was felt that for an American youth to go directly from the High School to University life at Oxford would be a detriment to his future career in America, since it would deprive him of those University associations and friendships in his own country which so often exercise a profound influence on a man's after life. To handicap the Scholars for American life in this way would have been to defeat the expressed wish of Rhodes himself, as well as his expectation, since

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he undoubtedly hoped that they would become men of influence as they worked out their careers in their own country. Another consideration which influenced the Trustees in making this decision was that a man with some experience of life and accustomed to stand on his own feet seemed best fitted to hold a Scholarship which took him so far away from his home influences for a long period. It is difficult to see how men of this type can be any more unfitted for American citizenship by residence at Oxford than are the hundreds of American scholars who in recent years have gone to German Universities, in whose case the question has never, so far as I know, been raised. That the general life of the country is enriched by the return either from England or Germany of scholars equipped by what the Old World has to give in training and experience, only the most prejudiced will be inclined to doubt. In one aspect, the more narrow criticism seems ludicrous. At a luncheon party in Washington at which many prominent guests were present, the question was raised whether these Oxford-trained youths would fit readily into the American system on their return. Various opinions had been expressed; when one of the party, well known for his caustic humor as well as for his public services, placed the question in what was probably its true perspective by remarking that, "as we work in 800,000 or more Italians, Poles, Hungarians, Russians, Greeks, etc., every year, I think we shall manage fifty Anglicized Americans without difficulty."

Moreover, against any possibility that a Scholar's attachment to his own country may be weakened by residence at Oxford must be placed one somewhat unexpected result which has followed from carrying out the terms of the will. It is a matter of common remark among the Scholars themselves that they meet on singularly close and intimate terms at the English University a more comprehensive and typically representative body of their fellow countrymen than they could count upon meeting at the average, and perhaps at any, American University. With complete impartiality the compulsion of the Rhodes Scheme draws Scholars from each individual State of the Union, North, South, East and West. The Americanism kept alive at Oxford should, therefore, be peculiarly broad and national; the intimate associations formed by the men are co-extensive with the Union itself.

But, manifestly, the value of the Scholarships to the United

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States will depend on the personality of the men who are sent to take advantage of them. According as the material selected is commonplace or exceptional, so will be the result. In the provinces of Canada, in the States of Australia, throughout the other British colonies, the Rhodes Scholarships are already regarded as the chief prizes open to all-round University students. With picked men of these countries, with others selected under the direction of the German Emperor himself, as well as with the young men of Great Britain, the American Scholars will therefore have to compete. To take an honorable place among such men and in competition for such honors, the best the country has to give is not too good.

But will the Scholarships attract the best men, or will America care to send them?

Doubtless, there are numberless cases in which students will not care to break in, with three years of life abroad, upon the purely American training which they have planned for themselves. But in a population of more than eighty millions of people, with its infinite variety of interests, there must be an immense demand for every type of finished training and special accomplishment. The University students of the United States are now numbered by tens of thousands. That a hundred of the best of these should at any given time find the opportunity offered by the Scholarships the best thing for themselves and for their country, does not seem an unreasonable expectation.

I have often been asked in the United States what Oxford has to give to an American student which he cannot get as well or better at his home universities. There is, of course, in the case of the Rhodes Scholar, the opportunity for three years of additional training at a famous centre of culture, in freedom from the pecuniary anxiety which so often interferes with the efforts of aspiring students compelled to fight their own way, a class from which a large proportion of candidates are drawn. In a country where the haste of the young to enter upon the practical work of life without adequate foundation training is a common complaint among educators, the inducement which the Scholarships give to a considerable group of young men to prolong the period of training would seem to be beyond debate a good thing.

But, leaving this advantage aside, I am inclined in my answer to this question to give the first place to the wider point of view

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to be gained in an Old World centre of training. If politically inclined, the American Rhodes Scholar finds himself in England in close touch with the politics of an Empire which covers one-fifth of the world, embraces nearly one-fifth of its population, and illustrates in its extraordinarily varied system every form of government, from extreme democracy to paternal and almost autocratic rule. He has close at hand, for study if he should so wish, the "Mother of Free Parliaments," with its great political traditions which have been the foundation of free government in America as elsewhere. He is within easy reach of France, Germany, Italy and other European countries, where he may spend his holidays, acquiring their languages and comparing their political and administrative systems. All this makes for that breadth of view which seems essential for certain forms of national service.

For the same reason, I am inclined to think that no class of American students would reap greater advantages from the Rhodes Scholarship than those who look forward to journalism as a profession. The journalists of a nation which, in its diplomatic, financial, commercial and naval relations, has become, almost in spite of itself, a World Power, require a world outlook which can only be got through knowledge of other nations. Here, if anywhere, the broad point of view is a national advantage and even a necessity.

But the actual range of study which Oxford presents to a student is wide. It may perhaps be best illustrated by mentioning the distribution of work among the whole body of Rhodes Scholars during the past year. Jurisprudence attracted the largest number, as thirty-eight of the men took the ordinary Honor course and seven pursued the work leading to a B.C.L. degree. Natural science came next, with eighteen in the Honor course and seven seeking a B. Sc. degree. In *Literae Humaniores,* which has for centuries given Oxford's best training and greatest distinctions, there were twenty. There was the same number in the History school. Following these were Theology, English Literature, Modern Languages, Mathematics and Economics, in all of which the higher courses were taken by numbers ranging from five to ten. Oriental Languages, Medicine, Forestry, Anthropology, Geography and Engineering, each attracted a smaller number.

No Oxford man would claim that in all these subjects Oxford

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

holds a foremost place, as she certainly does in some. Yet this can be positively said: that as yet no Rhodes Scholar, American, Colonial or German, out of about 300 that have been elected, has appeared at Oxford who found the course of study laid down for him in any one of these subjects beneath the level of his powers. It is a common opinion among the men that the three years allowed them are all too short for what Oxford expects them to do, and which they must do if they are to gain the University's distinctions.

They have thus learned their own limitations. They have found that the training of the best English students is better than what they themselves have had, and that only determined work can gain the honors the University has to give, and which are freely open to their competition. Above all, they have learned what Mr. Rhodes meant when he said that life at Oxford would give them a larger outlook on the world. There is no difference of opinion among the men on this point. They feel that they have got something that home could not possibly have given them.

It must always be remembered that few Englishmen take an Oxford course merely as a professional training, but rather to secure a broad basis of general culture on which to found professional training. This means some years of waiting before the actual work of life is begun, but these are years which leave a man with a stamp which can hardly be got in any other way. The past of a University counts for much in giving this stamp; and here, perhaps, lies the peculiar secret of Oxford's power. The Rhodes man finds himself there in immediate touch with literary and scholarly traditions among the noblest and most inspiring in the world. In its very buildings, illustrating as they do the noble conception of our common ancestors of what was due to education and to a home of learning, he will naturally imbibe a reverence for the past which gives a truer perspective to life than is usually obtained in newer communities. He can add the culture and experience of the Old World to the energy and hopefulness of the New, with which, presumably, he is himself filled. What he actually gets from Oxford, as from any University, will no doubt depend primarily on what he brings to it himself. What a really able man *can* get is probably best measured by what Oxford has given the world in the past. For some centuries and up to the present day, she has turned out in steady sequence a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remarkable succession of men "qualified," to use the words of the stately Bidding Prayer used at University services, "to serve God in Church and State." Historians, theologians, philosophers, teachers, jurists, economists, writers in prose and verse; the long list comprises the names of men who in all these departments of human effort have powerfully influenced the thought, not only of England and America, but of mankind. An even more characteristic product remains to be specially mentioned; of one of which Oxford has perhaps especial reason to be proud. This is what may be described as the literary statesman—the man who combines practical ability in the management of great affairs with culture and facility in letters—who to-day is Premier, Cabinet Minister or great administrative official, and to-morrow, when freed from the cares of office, is the brilliant writer, perhaps on some subject far removed from his political work.

Mr. Gladstone, turning from the cares of state to write volumes on Homeric theories or theological subtleties; Lord Rosebery, exercising his keen intellect in times of leisure on Napoleonic problems, political biography or literary appreciations; Mr. Bryce, expounding the Holy Roman Empire or the American Commonwealth; Mr. (now Viscount) Morley, filling up the intervals between governing Ireland and India with essays or biographies that are English classics; Mr. Balfour (a Cambridge example) discussing the Foundations of Belief; Lord Curzon writing on Asiatic, Lord Milner on Egyptian, problems—may be taken as illustrations to explain what is meant by the literary statesman. It will not be questioned that through such men the universities have added distinction and refinement to political life in England, without weakening its practical effectiveness. No other country possesses this type of public man in an equal proportion. The careers of such men as President Roosevelt and Mr. John Hay would seem to prove that, in the vast civilization of the United States, there is beginning to be in political as there has long been in diplomatic life, abundant room and recognition for the same type of public man.

President Roosevelt once asked me with what type of young Englishman American students would come in contact at Oxford. I had no hesitation in replying: "At any rate, with the men who will be ruling England in the next generation." When the President expressed some surprise at my confidence on this point, I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could only say that I had not known any British Cabinet formed within my recollection which did not have at least half its members Oxford men, and that what was true of the past and of the present would almost certainly be true of the future. So fixed is this tradition that Oxford and Cambridge are breeding-places for statesmen that the leader of a great political party in England would be considered rather remiss in his party duties if he did not keep an eye on the promising young men of the Universities with a view to bringing them into Parliament.

But, great as has been Oxford's past, I have little doubt that she has before her a future as great or greater still. In spite of the growth of her daughter lands, the title deeds of our race are in Britain still—rooted in her ancient universities as in her other institutions; and she will not resign them without a struggle in this or any other sphere. In the Humanities, in Theology, Jurisprudence and History, the Schools of Oxford still challenge comparison, after all these centuries, with any in the world. It is true that, in other centres of learning during this last fifty years, the strongest trend of the new educational movement has been toward Science rather than the Humanities. This is particularly the case in American and Colonial Universities from which the Rhodes Scholars are drawn, and where overpowering practical needs suggest practical training. Already Oxford has yielded in some degree, admittedly to her advantage, to this tendency. How far is it well that she should go still further in view both of her own good and of her world-wide relations? The question is a nice one. It is yet to be proved that the later tendency is the higher. If the further cultivation of Science involved neglect or limitation of her work in other spheres which she has so long done so efficiently, and under which she has in every generation trained intellects which have shed glory on our race, there would be a strong argument for confining her energies to the old task, and for leaving science to London and Leeds, Chicago and Boston, Montreal and Melbourne.

For, admitting all that science has done in enabling us to master and direct the forces of nature, the truth still remains that "the noblest study of mankind is man"—and man's upward struggle toward the highest is embodied in language, literature and philosophy. For these studies Oxford has always stood, and it is to be hoped will always stand. We may be sure, too, that,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when modern universities have pressed scientific training to its utmost bound, they will be driven back to ancient founts of learning in the realms of human thought for higher inspiration still.

A powerful movement is now going on to strengthen the University on many sides, and as this is done science will have due consideration. In various departments of scientific teaching and research much progress has of late years been made, and many projects are under contemplation.

There are, however, certain other lines on which Oxford seems to me likely to develop which do not interfere in the least with its past traditions, while in pursuing them she will open up to herself an immense future of usefulness and influence. The expansion of her already distinguished school of Jurisprudence to meet the needs of a nation which has to administer a greater variety of law than any other is one of these. A great Imperial Law School must necessarily take a wide outlook. The final courts of appeal for the Empire are required at times to interpret the French code in Quebec and Mauritius; the Roman-Dutch law of the Cape of Good Hope and Guiana; the Hindoo and Mohammedan law of the Indian Empire, while judges trained in England have to administer Egyptian law. The opportunity seems to be offered to Oxford of becoming a place where the best training can be obtained in every branch of law in use under the British flag, as well as in international law, for which British people have more frequent use from their world-wide connection than any other nation. The School of History, again, almost unique in its admirable tutorial system, has long since been raised to distinction by association with names like Stubbs, Froude, Freeman, and others equally well known in historical research. It has lately been strengthened, under the direct influence of the example set by Cecil Rhodes, by the foundation of a Chair of Colonial History, with special provision that this shall cover the history of the American Colonies up to the time of the Revolution. No doubt the University would give an equal welcome to any founder who would endow a Chair of later American History. Widening national needs will powerfully influence the further development of its other schools, especially those of Modern and Oriental Languages, Geography, Forestry, Agriculture and Economics.

The truth is that, while Oxford has in her buildings and tradi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions all the charms of antiquity, she has also in the life that flows through her streets and quadrangles the qualities of a perennial youth. It is perhaps this combination which has enabled her to weave so strong a spell of influence over succeeding generations of her sons, and not least over those who now come to her in such numbers from the ends of the earth. They have been welcomed warmly at the ancient University, which appreciates their freshness of mind, their earnest outlook on life and their practical turn of thought. College authorities regard them, as a rule, with favor, and, while often critical of their scholarship, agree that the average of seriousness in work among them is high.

The most serious criticism of the American Scholars that I have heard at Oxford is from themselves. They are disposed to question whether America in sending them has sent the best she has to give, and it is a point about which they are sensitive. They have urged that Oxford's demand for Greek cuts out from competition many of those who might most ably represent their respective States. As a slight concession to this opinion, a regulation has lately been made by which the minimum of Greek which is still asked for by the University may be acquired subsequent to election, if the Committees of Selection recognize in a candidate very exceptional ability in other fields of learning. It is even possible that Oxford may soon give up compulsory Greek.

As has been mentioned before, two groups of American Scholars, eighty in all, have already completed their three years' course, and have returned to their own country with such further equipment for the work of life as Oxford training, combined with European travel and observation, can give them. As the will of Rhodes makes provision in perpetuity for the education of two Scholars from each State, this is but the beginning of a long succession of similar groups of Scholars who will year after year return to America with the stamp of Oxford upon them. Those who have returned seem to have dropped without difficulty and apparently with acceptance into educational and professional careers. Judging from these earlier results, within a very few years men with Oxford training will be found in most American Universities and Colleges. This is a fact which should impress on those who select the Scholars a deep sense of the responsibility laid upon them.

There is no doubt that the acceptance of a Rhodes Scholarship

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entails on the winner also a good deal of responsibility. A man who gains it is watched with attention and interest by the community which he represents; as a selected man, a good deal is expected from him in the community to which he goes with a prize much larger than what is usually provided there to assist a student's career. He becomes more or less a marked man in whom a large public is interested; whose success or failure is widely noted.

If I were asked to say in a word to what type of man the Scholarship can be most profitably and justly awarded, I would say to a man of power, promise and high character. It was all-round men of character of whom Rhodes was thinking when he outlined the principles on which he wished his men to be selected.

Year by year, those who have won distinction in every walk of life, in literature, art, statesmanship, diplomacy, as viceroys of great provinces and leaders of men, come back to their old University at Oxford to receive the honors she has to give as their highest meed of praise for work well done. The ambition to be placed upon those rolls of honor will not be least, we may be sure, in those who come to her now as Rhodes Scholars from distant lands.

I may be permitted to close this paper with a quotation from an address given last summer to an educational gathering in the State of New York by the American Ambassador to England. He said:

"I have met with these Rhodes Scholars at their annual reunion at Oxford; and I am glad to testify here at home to their admirable appearance and conduct, and to the favorable opinions of them expressed to me by the Oxford dons with whom I conversed. As one saw them together, breaking in upon the cloistered quiet of those historic halls, he might almost imagine himself at a big Middle West college in our own country. He would scarcely be able to single out the German Rhodes Scholars from the rest, and quite unable to tell Americans from Australians or Rhodesians or Newfoundlanders or Cape-Colonists or New-Zealanders. But about them all was the air of new worlds and a new era. One might almost fancy their eyes had already seen the glory of the time when, under the leadership of the English-speaking peoples,

"'The war drum throbbed no longer, and the battle-flags were furled,
In the parliament of man, the federation of the world.'"

Would that the words could reach the ears of the silent sleeper on the Matopos, whose vision they seem to outline.

GEORGE R. PARKIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

"The Studies in Mystical Religion,"* by Rufus M. Jones, of Haverford College, is a book tracing the witness and weighing the evidence of mystical experience from its first Christian sources to the end of the English Commonwealth. It is a book of wide and conscientious research, solid and steady structure and noble aim. The style, considering the difficulties of the subject and the kind of reading and study in which the author must long have been immersed, is clear and definite, free of any attempt to dazzle or confuse. Those who have come to feel that the seat of authority in religion lies in the first-hand experience of the soul will turn eagerly to it, opening up as it does so many channels of the spiritual life of the past.

If at first there is a shade of disappointment that the treatment is of the mystic sense as it affected groups of men rather than as it filtered through the individual soul, this is lost again in the appreciation of the value of the historic material here gathered together and systematically set forth. It is quite true that wherever there has been a great mystic there have also been disciples, just as wherever there has been a revelation there have been followers of the light; but it is the initial experience which is most vital, original, yielding to study the most fruitful results; whereas, whenever an emotion, an idea, a perception is captured by the many, it flows over them in shallower spread, at lower level.

Mr. Jones traces the mystic sense from its first sources in primitive Christianity, as it is offered in St. John the Evangelist and St. Paul, through the ministry and organization of the early church; he shows the rebound to prophecy in Montanism, after faith which had meant an inward trust in Christ and response to

* "Studies in Mystical Religion." By Rufus M. Jones. New York: Macmillan & Co., 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Him had become a set of formulated doctrines called "The Faith"; he counts among the elements borrowed from Greek philosophy the influence of Plato, the immense sway of Plotinus and the neo-Platonic school; he sets forth—slightly, of necessity—the mystic elements in the teachings of the Church Fathers, particularly dealing with Gregory of Nyssa and St. Augustine; and, after two chapters devoted to Dionysius the Areopagite and to John Scotus Erigena, he turns entirely to the mystical outpouring as it affected those spiritual groups that spread over mediæval Europe, the Waldenses, the spiritual Franciscans, the Friends of God, the Brotherhood of the Common Life, the Lollards, the Anabaptists, the Family of Love, etc. The Waldensian, the Wycliffite and Anabaptist movement, the author admits, were non-mystical; but he includes them as important in the general trend toward a more inward and personal religion.

He has been diligent in searching the archives and has added new and valuable material in the cases of Amaury and Gerson; and in the Introduction particularly and in the chapters on Eckhart and John Scotus Erigena, he has given eloquent and vivifying expression to the ancient story of the soul's ascent.

The result, as the author tells us, of thirty years of adult religious experience, thought and study, and of the major part of seven years of actual composition, Baron von Hügel's study of the mystical element in religion* is a great mine of thought and fact, containing the stuff of a half-dozen books. It is less a biography of that almost unknown saint of the latter half of the fifteenth century, Caterinetta Fiesca Adorna, than a study of the course and validity of the mystical sense illustrated by this unusually healthy-minded and independent saint.

The book has a treble interest, historico-critical, philosophical and religious, and of these the first two are the more interesting. As Rufus Jones used a study of the mystical consciousness to lead up to the doctrine and discipline of the Friends, one of the broadest and freest of Christian sects, so Baron von Hügel uses the same material to prove the eternal and lasting predominance of the Roman Catholic Church, which contradiction is no censure

* "The Mystical Element of Religion, as Studied in St. Catherine of Genoa and her Friends." By Baron Friedrich von Hügel. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1908.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or depreciation of the mystic sense, but merely tends to show how its breadth and charity can carry any number of little human sects upon its bosom.

The mystic who has most pronouncedly influenced Baron von Hügel is St. John of the Cross; and it is noteworthy that his subject, St. Catherine, drew her inspiration, after the Johannine and Pauline writings, from Dionysius the Areopagite and that exquisite Franciscan poet, Jacaponi da Todi.

The first essay in the book is an extremely stimulating and interesting study on the triad of principles in the religious life in which the author asserts that no religion can be adequate that does not take into account both multiplicity and unity and offer both elements to the seeking soul. He points out that as the appeal to a child is ever external and traditional—literally an object, a symbol and a story—so the appeal to youth is rational and speculative, calling upon the reasoning, argumentative, abstractive side of nature; whereas, in maturity, having seen the limits set to human reason, man has recourse to an active and volitional religion, a religion tested by deeds and proved by feeling which the author calls "experiential mystical."

He traces this development of the religious sense through the life of man, through the history of thought, in a way full of stimulating suggestion; and it would be a valuable contribution to the history of mystic thought if this portion of the book might be more fully elaborated and made into a volume by itself.

The second volume of this work is a study of the psychophysical temperament as exemplified in the Saint of Genoa, her obligation to the writings that touched her, her doctrines of conduct, and a final summing up of the whole book tracing tendencies through asceticism, social religion and the scientific habit of mind to the mystical element in religion.

The author's subject is a difficult one, and his style is more than necessarily obscure. The book loses by being over-weighted, but it is a valuable addition to the scholarship and research of mystic literature. No one who attempts to know the strain of mysticism that runs through philosophy or religion can afford to pass the book by.

Mr. Gardner is generally an admirable biographer, learned, judicious, a man of letters as well as a scholar, at home alike in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. He seems, also, in perfect accord with the church to which St. Catherine gave such splendid devotion, such incomparable obedience. In his Life* of her he has called up again the figure of Catherine Benincasa in her habit as she lived; shown her delicacy of feeling, her impassioned piety, her sound sense, her practical enthusiasm—but the *saint* he has not shown. He records with untroubled historic calm her ecstatic visions, her insensibility to pain when in trance, her clairvoyant power, her living upon the Blessed Sacrament alone for long periods, her receiving the supreme grace of the stigmata. So did the Seraphic Virgin live and strive—so did she die daily for humanity; but when all is said, why seraphic? This is the trouble. To her biographer, acute, scrupulous, loyal, has been denied the unique thing which made up the life of his saint —the mystic consciousness. Therefore the book leaves the reader cold and unilluminated. Had Mr. Gardner loved the saint a degree more, he would have refrained from writing, would have waited for one more illuminated. Yet this book could ill be spared. So far as this world goes, it is extraordinarily alive and interesting. The writer has had access to the secret archives of the Vatican, has thrown new light on the Great Schism and related that episode with extraordinary lucidity and impartiality.

The book has not the charm or the zest of his books on Ferrara, but it has all the learning of his books on Dante and yet more humanity. And taking into account how difficult it is for the modern Anglo-Saxon mind to relish the amorous phraseology of the more romantic Latin in dealing with sacred subjects, one is glad that the spiritual espousals of the soul to its Lord should have been treated by an English gentleman, clear-eyed and healthy-minded, and with the spiritual humility which accepts though it cannot understand. This book, with all its historic accuracy and careful research, still leaves room for a Life of St. Catherine the mystic.

Some twelve years ago Mr. William T. Brooke, of the British Museum, picked up a little manuscript book of poetry on a street book-stall for a few pence. It was unsigned and gave no clue to authorship; but Mr. Brooke, whose knowledge of English

* "Saint Catherine of Siena." By Edmund J. Gardner. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1908.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sacred poetry is as extensive as that of any man living, at once recognized that it was great work by a great hand. The story of how the finder, with the help of Dr. Grosart and Mr. Bertram Dobell, searched the British Museum manuscripts for a clue, the discovery of the two prose volumes containing some of the poems, and the careful reconstruction of the life and the work of Thomas Traherne, B.D. (1636?-1674), is one of the most romantic in the history of literature. Two centuries and a quarter after the author's death, Mr. Bertram Dobell brought out the first edition of Thomas Traherne's Poems and last year saw a reprint of his "Centuries of Meditations."*

Traherne is a mystic of the type of Blake and Whitman, born with trailing clouds of glory still clinging to his perceptions: "Certainly Adam in Paradise had not more sweet and curious apprehensions of the world than I when I was a child." And although his vision was for a time obscured by a mischievous education, he reached it again, never to let it go.

"The image of God implanted in us guided me to the manner wherein we were to enjoy. . . . To enjoy the treasures of God in the similitude of God is the most perfect blessedness God could devise. . . . I was most infinitely satisfied in God and knew there was a Deity because I was satisfied. For in exerting Himself wholly in achieving thus an infinite Felicity, He was infinitely delightful, great and glorious, and my desires so august and insatiable that nothing less than a Deity could satisfy them. This spectacle once seen will never be forgotten. It is a large part of the beatific vision. A sight of happiness *is* happiness. It transforms the soul and makes it heavenly, it powerfully calls us to communion with God and all His creatures and makes us to see them in a divine and eternal light."

This representative passage gives a good idea of the author's approach to life. Mr. Dobell claims for the "Centuries" the place in Protestant hearts held by the "Imitation" among Catholics. But exquisite in spirit and style as is this book, no such division can be made. There will always be a large majority who see the misery of human life and to whom deliverance can only come by much suffering and discipline, while here and there, oftener and oftener, one hopes, will come a "once-born," who from the beginning feels the Kingdom of Heaven within and has only the vision of innocency and joy.

* "Centuries of Meditations." By Thomas Traherne (1636?–1674); edited by Bertram Dobell. Published by The Editor. Charing Cross, London. 1908.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This reprint, one may safely say, is the most valuable contribution to mystical literature since the "*Theologia Germanica.*"

With the help of wide margins and thick, soft, yellow paper, "John the Baptist"* fills out a large square apple-green volume. This is a terrible play in its brevity, truth and dramatic command—bare and bald as a fleshless skeleton and almost as dreadful. It is the work of a master who feels, for the moment, not weakened, only very old and very tired. Salome and Herodias smile subtly like a pair of Leonardo's women; and the common people, oppressed by Rome and the Law, stagger in the streets and faint in the desert just as Holbein might have painted them. But the figure of the precursor is racked with the pangs of this, our own century, torn with our doubts, wasted with our questionings. A power is on him greater than himself; and dimly he finds out that the clue to the universe is not wrath, but love; and in the light of that knowledge he goes smiling to the marriage feast; for "out of no man's mouth may the name of sin sound, save out of the mouth of one that loveth."

The author of "Sodom's Ende," "Johannesfeuer" and "Die Ehre" is a great master and a man of great ideas, and he never quite forgets his wrath against the mammon of unrighteousness. "Renegades will ye be unto all eternity," he cries, "ye men of universal utility who manure your acres with the blood of those who have died for you." He has chosen here to utter once more a pain deeper than our social travail, and—being himself—he offers no anodyne, only a clue. A poignant book like this, however grim, sinister and austere, is yet a poignant good.

"Tono-Bungay"† is a novel, big, human, noble, serious, vital, worth while. Here are not the conventions of the novel or the theatre, but the concerns of real people, their dominant preoccupations and their scale of values. Mr. Shaw, too, has tried to show these, but he does not convince because his figures are hollow inside despite their wit and sentiment. George Ponderevo is not hollow inside. While not so great, he is as faithfully portrayed, as absolutely real, as Emma Bovary. Furthermore, here

* "John the Baptist." By Herman Sudermann. Translated by Beatrice Marshall. New York: John Lane & Co., 1909.

† "Tono-Bungay." By H. G. Wells. New York: Duffield & Co., 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is an Anglo-Saxon book that deals with men as men and women as women as straightforwardly as a Continental. This is not merely something written to exploit theories or politics; it is not even a mere transcript from life; it is a Book.

Mr. Orcutt places his new story* in Florence and Fiesole, where his hero and heroine repair for their honeymoon and the following winter. Friends and villas and motor-cars are at their disposal, and one might look to see the course of true love run smooth. The young husband, however, falls under the spell of intellectual preoccupations—so we are told—and neglects his wife. It is a theme as old as Lucretius. The wife, in this case, furnishes her husband with an intellectual affinity in the person of her closest girl-friend, and here we have at once the material of the drama. The happy ending and general reconciliation, with everything as good as new, or better, emerge promptly in the last chapter, and the only matters left wholly in the shadow to stimulate our curiosity are the names of the writers who exercised the spell. They are never more definitely named than "the old-timers," "the ancient writers" and "the humanists"—a goodly army, indeed, to be concerned in so small a game as a honeymoon misunderstanding.

The hand being forever still that wrote this charming little romance, "Katrine,"† it is with real regret that one chronicles its vivacity, wit and insight. The dashing Irish folk, ranging from Dermott McDermott, with his lies, his chivalry, his generosity, to the old nurse Nora, who tells her charge that "to the Irishwoman the drame [of love] comes but wanst," show up well and vividly against the rather faded and pale Southern Aristocracy with their false ideals and paltry traditions. One could almost wish the lovely and gifted Katrine, direct, elemental, loving and strong-souled, could have forgotten the weak-kneed Southern lover and escaped his plantation and his hopelessly silly mother. However, that is not the story, but rather how she trained the man into a worthy and fine being and how wherever she went she carried with her high courage, genius, beauty and sunshine.

* "The Spell." By William Dana Orcutt. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1909.

† "Katrine." By Elinor Macartney Lane. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1909.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS,

LONDON: PARIS: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *May, 1909.*

SPECULATION has been on edge for some time to see how the Chancellor of the Exchequer would surmount the financial difficulties of his problem. That there would be a deficit and a heavy one every one knew. The increase in the Navy Estimates, the cost of financing the Old-Age Pensions scheme, and a year of commercial depression had combined to make it inevitable that expenditure should have outrun receipts and that new taxes would have to be imposed. Writing in the March number of this REVIEW I observed: "No one can yet say definitely how much the Chancellor of the Exchequer will be obliged to raise by fresh taxation if he means to pay his way; but $75,000,000 does not appear to be an extravagant estimate." The figure mentioned has turned out to be the precise figure of the deficit. Mr. Lloyd George made a welcome innovation by circulating before the introduction of the Budget a memorandum setting forth the revenue and expenditure for 1908-09 and the estimated revenue and expenditure for 1909-10 on the existing basis of taxation. The memorandum showed that the year 1908-09, instead of yielding a surplus, had produced a small deficit of some $3,500,000—a deficit that would have been much larger but for heavy clearances from bond in the last quarter of the year to avoid the new taxes. For the ensuing year the revenue, on the existing basis of taxation, was estimated at $15,000,000 less than in 1908-09, and the expenditure at $60,000,000 more. But while Mr. Lloyd George's anticipatory memorandum showed that he would thus have to meet a deficit of $75,000,000, it did not show how he would meet it. The secret, of course, was not disclosed until the Budget speech. Everybody sympathized with Mr. Lloyd George's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

position. It was his first Budget. It was also the first time since they came into office in 1906 that the Liberals have been confronted with a deficit. In the first three years of their administration they paid off debt to the extent of over $200,000,000; they halved the sugar tax, repealed the coal duty, halved the increase of the tea duty, reduced the income tax on the smaller earned incomes by threepence in the pound, and lightened the annual burden of taxation by some $35,000,000. Now, however, they were face to face with the results of remissions that may perhaps have been premature and injudicious and of expenditures on Old-Age Pensions that they had piled up with no sparing hand. Within the limits of the cardinal Free-Trade doctrine of a tariff for revenue only, they had somehow or other to squeeze $75,000,000 out of the pockets of the people. The Tariff Reformers, I need hardly say, watched their dilemma without any great solicitude, reckoning that Mr. Lloyd George's proposals, whatever they might prove to be, would merely proclaim the bankruptcy of Cobdenite finance, and that the heavier the burden of direct taxation the more inclined would England be to resort to their panacea of Protection. The situation, in short, when Mr. Lloyd George rose on April 29th to unfold his Budget, was as replete as it well could be with all the elements of national, party and personal interest.

In the event Mr. Lloyd George produced a bold and momentous Budget and made a bad speech. He spoke too long—he was on his feet for four hours and a quarter—and a great deal of what he had to say took the form of a series of essays or manifestoes on the future policy of the Government. Except that they showed the unescapable connection between finance and social reform, these essays or manifestoes, which their author read off at breakneck speed, were not very relevant, were decidedly wearisome, and ended by obscuring Mr. Lloyd George's proposals in a mist of words. Even now, nearly a week after the speech, a great deal of uncertainty exists as to the details of the Chancellor's scheme, and Mr. Balfour who criticised it very skilfully and effectively on May 3rd had to confess that he was speaking from an inevitable half-knowledge. But the broad principles and aims of the Budget may at least be disentangled. First of all, Mr. Lloyd George largely extended the system of graduation in the Income Tax. For the future all earned incomes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

below $10,000 will pay as now at the rate of three and one-half cents on the dollar; but the rate on earned incomes above $10,000 and on all unearned income will be raised from five cents to six cents. In the case of incomes above $25,000 there will be a super-tax of two and one-half cents on the dollar on such portion of the income as exceeds $15,000. At the same time, there will be an abatement of $50 per child for all children under sixteen on incomes below $2,500. Secondly, Mr. Lloyd George established a scale of License Duties which, for the first time, will make licensed premises pay in proportion to the real value of the monopoly given them by the State, and from this source he expects to obtain $13,000,000. Thirdly, he raised the Death Duties. In future an estate of over $25,000 will pay four per cent.; over $50,000, five per cent.; over $100,000, six per cent., and so on, till estates of over $5,000,000 pay fifteen per cent. Fourthly, Mr. Lloyd George imposed an extra ninety-four cents per gallon on spirits and an extra sixteen cents per pound on unmanufactured tobacco. Fifthly, he increased the settlement, legacy and succession duties. Sixthly, he hopes to raise over $3,000,000 by adding to the stamp duties on transfer or sale of property, on bonds to bearer and on transactions in shares. Seventhly, he taxed motor-cars at rates varying from $10.50 on a car under six horse-power to $300 on cars above sixty horse-power and imposed a duty of six cents a gallon on petrol. The proceeds of these two taxes, however, are to be devoted, under national authority, to repairing, extending and improving the road system of the country. Eighthly, Mr. Lloyd George clapped a tax of twenty per cent. on the unearned increment of land and a tax of one-fifth of a cent on the dollar on the capital value of undeveloped land and on undeveloped mining rights. Ninthly, the old sinking-fund, by which any surplus of revenue over expenditure went to reduce the Debt, is now to be added to a fund for agricultural development. Tenthly, the fixed sum set apart for meeting the interest on the Debt is to be reduced by $15,000,000 a year.

Unquestionably this is a very remarkable, courageous and contentious Budget. It is destined, like Sir W. Harcourt's Budget of 1894, the Budget that reorganized the Death Duties on their present basis, to mark an epoch in British finance. In its high license duties and its graduated dealings with the income tax it expands principles that were already a part, but an undeveloped

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part, of the British fiscal system. In its assertion of the right of the State to share in the landlord's unearned increment, and in its taxation, tentative as it is, of land values, it introduces, for the first time, principles long advocated by reformers, but never until now endorsed by any Chancellor of the Exchequer. It is emphatically a Free-Trade Budget; every penny it produces goes into the Treasury. It is not less emphatically a democratic Budget. It places the heaviest burden on the shoulders best capable of bearing it. It spares the necessaries of life and taxes the luxuries and the superfluities. It does not exempt the poor, but it touches them only in their indulgences, their whiskey and tobacco. A hostile critic summed it up as a Budget that encourages birth, discourages death and makes life intolerable in between. It is certainly a Budget that makes the rich man disgorge effectively. It will be violently opposed by the Unionists, by the brewers, by the Irish members (whose opposition, however, is confined to the extra tax on spirits), by the City men, by motorists, by all landowners, and by most of the well-to-do. It ought, on the other hand, to be popular with the great majority of the middle class whose incomes are less than $10,000 a year, and it is, I think, certain to be popular with the masses of the people. Nevertheless, it is an extremely complicated Budget, and arouses antagonism among a multitude of formidable interests. Already it is clear that an agitation is to be set on foot against it as a "Socialistic" experiment. I think it probable that as time goes on some of its provisions will have to be dropped and others simplified; and I am very confident that only skilful piloting will avail to steer it through Parliament. The House of Lords is already being urged to reject it, the Lords will have sense enough not to heed such suicidal advice. The Tariff Reformers are exhausting their vocabulary in abusing it, but in their heart of hearts, I fancy, they must recognize that it has fairly "dished" them. For the outstanding feature of the Budget is that it taps new sources of revenue which are bound to prove enormously and increasingly productive in the near future, if not at once, and that it must therefore be judged not merely for what it is, a potent instrument for social reform and a provision for the needs of the coming year, but as a scheme for meeting the requirements of many years to come so amply that it will render Protection superfluous.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PARIS, *May, 1909.*

FRANCE has not yet recovered from the bewilderment and panic caused by the postal strike. The sensational disclosures concerning the Navy which we daily read in the papers, and which, in other circumstances, would create a tremendous sensation, pass almost unnoticed. For once the chronology of events happens to be logical: certainly the latent reconstruction of a country by such deep and active influences as those which we have just seen at work is of wider import than even a long chain of errors and the wasting of billions where the national defence is at stake.

The postal strike is the most startling, but not, by any means, the most important episode of the evolution known as the Labor Movement. The public, no matter how enlightened, takes little interest in those low-life technicalities. They are dry reading, both wearisome and disquieting, and, somehow, always manage to look unreal. The ridiculous failure of the attempt at a general strike on May 1st, 1906, confirmed practically the whole country in a serene disbelief of any real danger from working-men's conspiracies. The birth of the federation of trades-unions' councils known as the C. G. T. (Confédération Générale du Travail), with the preparation of the General Strike as its avowed object, was certainly pointed out as the appearance of a most dangerous power, but even the Government declined to fight it in its cradle. Every now and then some disturbance of an exceptionally shocking character, for instance, the bloody scenes at Draveil or the Electricians' Strike (in the winter of 1907), would elicit a transient outcry against the anarchists at its head; but the revelation of it as a counterpart of the State within the State did not come home to the majority even of Deputies, and the attention given to its rapid progress remained almost exclusively academic. We must say that the mass of literature, mostly, of course, from the pens of jurists on the subject, is enormous and ought to have arrested even the casual observer; but things have only two ways of forcing themselves on general attention in this country, literature or catastrophic suddenness, and the publication of an article in the "*Correspondant*" on the remarkable socialist, George Sorel, only came two or three months before the postal strike. Even this did not at first shock the Parisians very much. Never was the good-humored levity of the national disposition better illustrated than during that blank empty week. Amuse-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment was the dominant note; it was amusing to see soldiers sorting letters which nobody delivered, amusing not to hear any news, and amusing to see popular men with evidently the right on their side coolly refusing to negotiate with the very unpopular country doctor, their chief or martinet; there was little surprise when, on the second or third day, the Marquis de Montebello, President of the League of Telephone Subscribers, brought encouragement and money to the rebels, and the protest in commercial circles was at no moment very strong. It was only towards the end of the strike that Pauron, the ringleader of the postal linemen, whispered to eight thousand men,—so breathless and silent that not one syllable was lost,—the communication made to him by the famous Pataud to the effect that in case of the least resistance on the part of the Government he would stop the electric light in Paris, as he had on two previous occasions, and arrange for an immediate strike on the State railways.

In any other circumstances this might have been thought brag, but the atmosphere being what it was, everybody felt that the electrician was like the madman with a lighted pipe near a barrel of powder, and terror was deep and universal. From that minute the C. G. T. became as familiar a bugbear as it had seemed chimerical. One realized that the General X whom the royalists are incessantly praying for is actually present among us, but in the guise of an unknown workman at the Bourse du Travail, and the common feeling at the end of a few hours was a passive admission of the reality of the danger with an expectation of catastrophe as unreasoned as the denial of its possibility was premature. In a few days you might read in such a paper as "*l'Eclair*" a statement on the necessity of giving the union a share in the Government and legislation. It is needless to speak of the triumph of the Socialist papers. The accession of the postal men, so far regarded rather as a *bourgeois* association, was an unhoped-for success opening up wonderful prospects. Clearly this tremendous bound forward of the power of association has been a revelation as well for those who welcome as for those who lament it. There is no exaggeration in saying that the light in which public events will henceforward be seen is entirely new.

Nobody has lost so much in this reversion of standpoint as the would-be tyrant whose fast increasing unpopularity I noticed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in my last letter, viz., the Chamber. The foreign press naturally insisted on the defeat of Government by the strikers, but this was an error of perspective almost unavoidable by people used to personal government of some sort. In France, where the feeling has been for thirty years—since the fall of Marshal MacMahon—that the Chamber is the only ruler, Clemenceau appeared, no doubt, in a false position, but the Chamber looked decidedly more beaten and ridiculous withal. Some independent deputies—M. de Mun, for instance—who had long warned Parliament against a crisis of this kind, took a mischievous pleasure in describing their colleagues' alarm and scandalized amazement. But the Parliamentary reports were sufficient to impress even outsiders with the crestfallen attitude of the majority. The questions put to M. Clemenceau and M. Barthou, even from the Socialist benches, were so destitute of urgency that they sounded like schoolboys' lessons. If the Government had been the routed party the Chamber would have overthrown them at a minute's notice, as they have done forty times before—remember especially M. Delcassé's shameful dismissal—but the Government never was so strong in Parliament as when its power was only a name. The deputies felt that this was no time for joking.

There was something unspeakably funny in the old appeal from the advanced press, like the "*Rappel*" and the "*Lanterne*," to the "republican feeling" of men who only meant business and expressed absolute contempt for empty words. We could see on the occasion of a meeting at the Sociétés Savantes, on April 2nd, what had become of the so-called "republican discipline"—*i. e.*, subordination to a superannuated political creed. A few deputies, MM. Steeg, Reinach, Buisson, Paul Boncour, etc., one or two of whom have honestly tried to raise Parliament above purely verbal politics, had taken seats on the platform and expected a cordial welcome from the audience. They were hooted down in a few minutes as belonging to a body decidedly regarded as a pack of lying *bourgeois*. Two days later, at another large meeting of nine thousand men at the Hippodrome, a State servant, M. Janvion, was perfectly explicit. One or two pithy sentences of which he delivered himself are likely to remain historical. "We are told that we are endangering the Republic. Indeed! The anti-republican reaction concerns us very little. We know only one class of opponents: not the *réactionnaires* (the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anti-republican opposition), but the *actionnaires* (shareholders). This Republic is only a caricature of monarchy, and we do not care for the Government which rules us: we have two Bastilles to take by storm; first Parliament and afterwards the State."

Addressing the same meeting, Pataud proposed the formation of a committee of twelve from various unions of officials, in imitation of the Electricians' permanent strike committee, so as to secure an effective preparation for a strike on a larger scale than that of the postmen, and his motion was adopted with unanimous applause.

The fact that even M. Clemenceau shrinks from having the C. G. T.—where this committee will find its natural home—dissolved, and a supremely dangerous revolutionist, like Pataud, arrested, shows the gravity of the situation. Two powers are in evidence: the working classes represented by the C. G. T. and the *bourgeois* classes represented by the Chamber, and their fighting ground is to-day perfectly definite. The old fallacy of one France united in common devotion to one republican ideal is exploded. Two interests are face to face and will not be reconciled by fine speeches or by such shams as the Income Tax Bill. The proletariate has organized itself privately, and has to be both legally organized and checked, or the rickety frame of our Society goes to pieces.

As a matter of fact, the Government looking to the more immediate danger are preparing a Bill defining the status of State servants, which will come under discussion in a few days, and will, it is hoped, remove at least the danger of another postal strike.

The question is: Is it not too late to tame into obedience men who have just become terribly conscious of their strength? Very naturally the Socialist press and very stupidly the opposition papers say that things are past recovery. Without prophesying let us see at least how matters stand.

I have not the space for a description of the "Syndicalist" organization at large, which, moreover, I have sketched in a previous letter. I must limit myself to the trades-union movement among officials. But the reader should bear in mind that French trades-unionism is distinctly revolutionary, that is to say, that the peaceful and conservative spirit which it often possesses in England, America and Germany only exists in this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country in a federation or two, that a "syndicate" is practically always directed *against* somebody or something, and that the whole syndicalist movement has been slowly evolved from the *bourgeois* doctrines of Socialism or collectivism, by working-men who understand it thoroughly, and will not let any outsider—were it Jaurès himself—interfere with it. Consequently when we speak of the progress of trades-unionism among State servants, we mean a powerful reaction against the centralizing spirit of the third Republic and not only a striving after corporate aggregation.

This was not recognized from the first. It is a curious fact that the first trades-unions formed by officials—those of the *cantonniers,* inferior postal agents, and arsenal workmen—were encouraged by the Government.

But this attitude dates from 1902, when M. Combes was in office, and when internal disturbances were, thanks to the Bloc, regarded as quite as impossible as a European war, and the sanguine Ministers were those cheerful subverters, M. Pelletan and General André.

However, even in those palmy days there was no unanimity in the Government on the subject, and M. Dubief, the then Minister of Public Works, obtained a decision from the Council of State against a union of sewermen. Two years later M. Rouvier prophesied what the result of the corporate movement among the postmen would be in terms which to-day appear of startling accuracy.

Instead of wavering between tolerance, prohibition and prophecy of evils, the Government would have been wise to pass a law against the spoils system scandalously flourishing in Parliament. A clear, legal text securing officials against the interference of deputies in local nominations and promotion would certainly have made such an unheard-of rebellion as the postal strike impossible. But the Chamber could not muster up courage to undertake its own reformation, and a policy of ashamed distrust of the unions only drove them faster in the direction of the C. G. T. Numberless "friendly societies" were founded (under the Act of 1901 on Associations, which is much more liberal than that of 1884 on trades-unions), especially among elementary school-teachers and postmen, and the members of these societies managed in many cases to get affiliated to the Trades-Unions' Councils. This

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

process is no doubt very illegal, but admission into the *Bourses du Travail* gives them a show of right to enjoy the benefit of the Act of 1884 and to claim the right of striking, which is the supreme object of their ambition. At the present moment the wave carrying Labor towards syndicalism can be said to be universal, and the tendency, among officials as well as in private industries, is in the direction of an arrangement enabling them —as the postmen very candidly said the other day—to treat on a footing of equality with the Ministers who employ them. This means nothing if not using the right of striking whenever they think themselves ill used. And this is what recent events have shown to be unbearable.

The solution propounded by the Government is a law defining the rights and duties of officials and putting an end to the wrongs they justly complained of. There is no mention in the text of affiliation to the trades-unions, and striking is an impossibility, but to an unbiased mind this limitation is a *prima facie* necessity.

The question is whether the postmen and teachers will see the law in this light. The leaders of the C. G. T. point out to them that this charter of their rights in reality binds them hand and foot, and now that they have tasted the pleasure of being revolutionists and no longer servants they will think that the argument has some weight. But the *bourgeois* element in them is strong, too; and an interview with the President of their Reading Committee, M. Demartial, shows that they still realize the stability and advantages of all sorts of their situation. The probability is that the postal clerks will affect to regard the law as a victory and rest satisfied in their offices, while the linemen, for instance, and generally the inferior agents, will grumble and try to dodge the law by individually joining trades-unions akin to their own.

This state of things leaves the syndicalist question where it was, and the C. G. T. remains a permanent danger; but the risk of another postal strike will be removed, or at least limited to the mechanics employed on the lines. Is this a small or a considerable gain? In spite of the prevalent terror, and of the ominous statements in the press, it seems to me that the commotion created by the strike enables us to appreciate the comparative security.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WASHINGTON, *May, 1909.*

THE Payne Tariff Bill, when it passed the House, was very far from satisfying those who during the campaign had demanded or promised a downward revision of the Dingley tariff. Such a thing, indeed, as a revision upward was never heard of at that time. It is important to keep in view the fact that the Payne Bill itself represents a glaring breach of faith, because, should the Aldrich Bill as it passes the Senate prove even more disappointing—which is almost certain to be the case—the utmost to be hoped for is that the Committee of Conference will restore the provisions of the Payne project. The conferees can do no more, they can adopt no innovations. Contrary to a current impression, the members of that committee are restricted by law to a choice between the wishes of the Senate and the wishes of the House, as these are embodied in the tariff bills emanating from those bodies, respectively.

Not in all, but in some very important, respects the duties levied by the Senate are heavier than those which were imposed by the House. To take a striking example, the Finance Committee of the Senate saw fit to assess iron ore at twenty-five cents a ton, and this proposal was adopted by the Senate on May 13th. Under the present (Dingley) law, iron ore is assessed at forty cents a ton, but the Payne Bill placed it on the free list. The assessment of iron ore at twenty-five cents a ton is a serious blow to the downward revisionists, because it implies that all the products of the raw material are also to be heavily burdened. In other words, the evidence given by Mr. Carnegie and other experts in steel manufacture is to be disregarded by the Senate. It cannot be pretended that the Senate imposed a duty of twenty-five cents a ton on iron ore for the sake of the addition it would make to the customs revenue; as a matter of fact, the whole estimated revenue from iron ore—the Cuban product which comes in under a reciprocity treaty being left out—is only $127,000.

It is true, on the other hand, that in some particulars the Senate has reduced the duties levied by the Payne Bill. Hosiery is an example. This commodity pays under the Dingley law a revenue of $4,000,000 annually. The Payne Bill raises the duty from sixty-five per cent. to eighty-five per cent., and the Senate cuts it down to the existing sixty-five per cent. It appears that as to the cheap grade of stockings (those that sell for five, ten

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and fifteen cents per pair), the domestic manufacturers now have the American market to themselves, the duty making it impossible for the foreigner to compete. The same thing is true of silk stockings and cashmere hosiery of fine grades. On the stocking, however, that now sells for twenty-five, thirty-five and fifty cents per pair, the Dingley law, with its duty of sixty-five per cent., has enabled the foreigner to compete, with the result that the consumer has got a good stocking and the American manufacturer has been forced to keep his business up to date—the proof of which is to be found in the fact that even during the recent panic the hosiery manufacturing business of the United States showed a large profit. We repeat that the Government also received an annual customs income of about $4,000,000 from imported hosiery of the grades in question. Should the duty be raised, however, to eighty-five per cent., the Government will obtain no revenue whatever from these grades of hosiery.

It is a memorable fact that, when the Senate Finance Committee's amendment placing a duty of twenty-five cents per ton on iron ore came to a vote, no fewer than eighteen Democrats voted in the affirmative and only ten Democrats in the negative. This extraordinary action, on the part of so many Democrats, was ascribed by some newspapers to brief speeches by Senators Bailey, Money and Daniel in which they maintained that, as it was necessary to impose duties on some articles in order to obtain sufficient revenue for the Government, iron ore was one of the imports which properly might be taxed. As we have already pointed out, there is absolutely no basis for the selection of iron ore with a view to the replenishment of revenue, since the whole income expected from the duty imposed on this commodity falls short of $130,000. The New York "Evening Post" puts its finger on the truth when it says that the reason why eighteen professed Democratic Senators voted to put a duty of twenty-five cents on iron ore is because no such thing as a Democratic party exists. With brains and principles both out of it, why should it pretend to be alive any longer. The eighteen Democratic Senators evidently forgot that free iron ore was one of the cardinal features of the Wilson Bill, as it passed the House in 1894. While the iron and steel schedule was under debate in the House, two proposals were made to put a duty on iron ore, but both were voted down. The duty was put back, however, by the Senate in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1894, as it was on May 13, 1909; but this was one of the things which President Cleveland had in mind when he denounced the changes made in the Wilson Bill by the Senate as "a work of perfidy and dishonor."

From a colloquy which took place between Senator Bailey and Senator Aldrich in the week ending May 15th, we infer that a vote on the proposed income-tax amendment of the Payne Bill will be reached at any moment. Can such an amendment be passed? The passage would require the votes of all the Democratic Senators and of at least fourteen Republican Senators. A belief is current that at least one Democratic Senator will be found voting in the negative, and not much confidence is expressed in the staunchness of all the fourteen Republican Senators credited to the insurgent list.

To sum up, it is already patent that those who had hoped for a sweeping revision of the Dingley law downward are bound to be disappointed. It is not for a moment to be expected that the Conference Committee will produce a measure made up of all the merits of the Payne Bill *plus* all the merits (if any) of the Aldrich Bill. The chances are that the outcome of the conference will be something decidedly inferior to the Payne Bill, which itself, viewed by and large, is by no means an improvement on the Dingley law.

How is President Taft likely to deal with such a measure? Will he veto it, or will he let it become a law while expressing his personal disapproval of it, as President Cleveland did in the case of the Wilson Bill after it had been emasculated by Mr. Gorman in the Senate? In Washington not one man in a hundred believes that Mr. Taft will withhold his signature.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

The Powers and the Hague Tribunal.

THE Temple of Janus used to be open in time of war; it was closed—all too seldom—during the prevalence of peace. It seems to be otherwise with the Temple at The Hague. When the world is at peace, its doors open and the delegates of the peoples enter its sacred precincts to discuss and formulate the rules under which conflicts shall be conducted when again one nation flings down the gage of battle to another. But when war actually breaks out, or when rumors or apprehensions of war are rife, there seems to be no recourse to the mediating offices which, it was fondly hoped, were to inaugurate a condition of millennial harmony among the great Powers of the earth.

In his Homeric work on "The Invasion of the Crimea," Kinglake describes the emotional wave of desire for peace at any price which, as a result of the optimistic anticipations engendered by the first International Industrial Exhibition at the Crystal Palace, swept over a considerable proportion of the population of England. Referring to the fantastic appeals made by visionary orators to responsive audiences to see to it that, so far as their influence could go, swords should be beaten into ploughshares and war should be studied no more, he records this significant fact: "The woman would subscribe, if her husband required it, to have this doctrine taught to charity children, but she would not suffer it to be taught to her own boy." Deep down in the gentle nature of the Englishwoman there survived from the ages of storm and stress a primal element—an approval of physical conflict—which determined her preferences and practical opinions.

For the present, at least, this primal element, common to the characters of the great Powers, appears to decide their attitude toward the Tribunal at The Hague. Irksome questions between a great Power and a country of secondary importance may be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

submitted to arbitration by this International Court. But, as between the great Powers themselves, it seems as if the principle illustrated by the life and practices of the Highland freebooter, Rob Roy MacGregor, is still of potent dominance:

> "The good old rule, the simple plan,
> That he should take who has the power,
> And he should keep who can."

Assuming that the hopes of the pious friends of peace had some foundation, that The Hague Tribunal should exercise a moderating function among the discordant claims of the nations similar to that discharged by our Supreme Court as between the States of the Union, there could scarcely be imagined an occasion when its judgment could more properly have been appealed to than was created by the action of Austria-Hungary in annexing Bosnia and Herzegovina. The international law of Europe had been deliberately and cynically violated. But never, even among those who most bitterly resented the indefensible action of the Dual Kingdom, was there a suggestion that the Powers should repair to the Tribunal at The Hague for its judgment upon the rights and wrongs of the case. The old *régime* was instinctively followed. There was a demand for a Conference of the Powers to consider the situation, and the demand was acquiesced in by the party most interested only on condition that the Conference should condone formally the Imperial breach of faith and regularize the territorial result of the Imperial violation of law. Then there was a careful calculation of military power, a forecasting of the possible outcome of a clash between the forces that would support and those which would oppose the action of Austria-Hungary, with the result that the flagrant theft of the Balkan provinces is now placidly regarded as a *fait accompli*. War was averted, as of old, simply by nervous fear as to what the consequences of war might be.

In view of such happenings, it seems futile to hope that the Tribunal at The Hague will speedily exercise a conclusive and paramount influence upon the actions and relations of the great nations of the earth; but is not the day coming when it must eventually do so, in large measure at least, for the maintenance of the old *régime* is becoming every year more and more burdensome and oppressive?

Univ. of Tulsa Library
Tulsa, Oklahoma

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED